A

# Defence and Continuation

OF THE

# DISCOURSE

Concerning the

# KNOWLEDGE

OF

# Jesus Christ,

And OUR

*Union* and *Communion* with *Him.*

With a particular respect to the

Doctrine of the Church of *England,*

And the Charge of

**Socinianism and Pelagianism.**

*By the same* AUTHOR.

*LONDON:*

Printed by *A. C.* for *Walter Kettilby*, at the Bishops-Head in St. *Pauls* Church-yard,

M. DC. LXXV.

TO

The moſt Reverend Father in GOD,

# GILBERT,

By Divine Providence,

LORD ARCHBISHOP

OF

# CANTERBURY,

*Primate* of all *England*, and *Metropolitan*,

AND

One of His Majeſties moſt Honourable Privy-Council, *&c.*

May it pleaſe your Grace,

IT *is not unknown to your Grace, that in a late Diſcourſe, according to my mean Abilities, I endeavoured to vindicate Chriſtian Religion from thoſe uncouth and abſurd Repreſentations, which ſome modern Divines, who are the great Fomenters of our preſent Factions, have made of it: And herein I thought, I ſhould do good ſervice,*

*not only to the common Cauſe of Chriſtianity (which is expoſed to the ſcorn of Atheiſtical Wits, for the ſake of ſuch Doctrins, as are ſo far from belonging to Chriſtianity, that they ſeem to be invented on purpoſe to affront the general ſenſe and underſtanding of Mankind,) but alſo to the beſt conſtituted Church in the World, which is rent and torn into a thouſand Factions for the ſake of theſe new Diſcoveries, which are admired for no other reaſon, but becauſe they are not underſtood.*

*And I have met with ſuch a Reward, as thoſe men uſe to do, who oppoſe any popular and inveterate miſtakes, hard Words and hard Cenſures; though as ſoft and gentle Arguments, as I could wiſh: But my Adverſaries have uſed one extraordinary piece of Art, which alone, I hope, will be ſufficient to make my Apology for this Addreſs.*

*It is well known, my Lord, what Friends they are to the Church of* England, *and yet now they take Sanctuary in our Church, and pretend a mighty Zeal for the* antient Catholick Doctrin *of it: Their great*

*quarrel*

*quarrel with me is, that I have contradicted the Doctrin of our Church, and they are very jealous leſt the Church ſhould by this means be diſadvantageouſly repreſented to the world; and think it the concernment of the Reverend Biſhops either to confute or cenſure ſuch Doctrins: And indeed would thoſe grave and wiſe Perſons hearken either to Papiſts or Fanaticks, they ſhould never want work; for whenever they find themſelves gravelled, they call upon the Church of* England, *to defend them againſt her moſt zealous Advocates and hearty Friends.*

*My Lord, were I in the leaſt conſcious to my ſelf of having deſerted the Doctrin of our Church, there is no Perſon, whom I ſhould ſo juſtly dread as your Grace, whoſe quick and piercing Judgment would eaſily detect ſuch a Prevarication, and whoſe great Authority could as eaſily cruſh ſo weak an Adverſary, and whoſe ſyncere and hearty Zeal and Fatherly Care and Affection for this Church would not ſuffer ſuch Tares to grow up in the midſt of the Wheat. But theſe excellent Accompliſh-*

*ments,*

*ments, wherewith God has in great goodneſs endowed your Grace for the Preſervation and wiſe Government of this Church in ſuch dangerous and critical times, render you as ſure a Refuge and Sanctuary to the Friends of our Church, as they make you formidable to her Enemies.*

*In this Aſſurance it is, that I humbly lay this my Defence at your Graces Feet, and entirely ſubmit it and its Author to your Judgment and Cenſure. If I have ſaid any thing blame-worthy, it has been hitherto out of invincible Ignorance and Miſtake, which I hope will plead my excuſe: And if I have (as I am verily perſuaded I have) made a true and faithful Repreſentation of the Doctrin of our Church, and vindicated it from ſuch Fanatical Innovations, as give the greateſt and the juſteſt cauſe of Scandal to all wiſe and conſidering men, I humbly beg your Graces Patronage, which is the only Security and Protection I deſire from the rude Clamors and vehement Reproaches of my Adverſaries.*

*I be-*

*I beſeech Almighty God to preſerve your Grace long among us in Health and Vigor, to protect his Church by your wiſe Counſels and Conduct, and to adorn your See with your exemplary Virtues, which is the hearty Prayer of*

Your GRACES

Moſt Humble and

Dutiful Servant,

*William Sherlock.*

# Imprimatur,

*Ex Æd. Lambethanis* *Tho. Tomkyns.*
April. 2. 1675.

# AN *INTRODUCTION* TO THE DEFENCE and CONTINUATION OF THE DISCOURSE CONCERNING THE KNOWLEDGE OF JESUS CHRIST, *&c.* CONTAINING *The Reaſons which moved me to write that* DISCOURSE.

THere is not a more lamentable ſight in the World, than the preſent ſtate of Religion, which is aſſaulted by ſo many ſubtil and malicious Adverſaries, crumbled into ſo many Sects and Factions, peſter'd with

ſuch infinite Diſputes, that it is time to cry out, as the Diſciples did in the Storm, *Help Lord, or we periſh.* And that, which makes the caſe ſo deſperate, is, that the Diſeaſe is too ſtrong for the Remedy, and the wiſeſt Preſcriptions do only ſtir and provoke, not expel the Humors; or as it is in ſome complicated Diſtempers, that w^ch is proper for one diſeaſe, is very hurtful for another; which makes the ſtate both of the Patient and Phyſician very dangerous; the one being likely to loſe his Life, and the other his Reputation. I was not wholly ignorant of theſe difficulties, when I ventured my late *Diſcourſe* into the world, but have now a more ſenſible experience, what it is to oppoſe inveterate prejudices; and what little hope there is of doing much good, when a man muſt contend, not againſt Reaſon and Argument, (in which way any ingenuous perſons will be glad to be overcome) but againſt Paſſion, & Intereſt, and popular Clamors, and the rude aſſaults of a ſpightful and unchriſtian Zeal.

And yet I cannot ſay, that my labour is loſt; for I am ſenſible, that my Diſcourſe has already ſerved to rectifie the miſtakes of ſome honeſt and unprejudiced men, and I hope may do ſo ſtill; for thoſe lit-

little and unmanly Arts which have been uſed to diſparage it and its Author, cannot long abuſe any ingenuous minds; and when the cheat is diſcovered, it will but give the greater reputation to abuſed truth and honeſty.

For this Reaſon I am reſolved not to betray a good Cauſe, but to venture once more, and to leave the ſucceſs to the Divine Grace and Providence, which is more peculiarly concerned for the intereſt of Religion, and true goodneſs; and if I ſhould ſee no other good effect of it, yet I can abundantly ſatisfie my ſelf in honeſt intentions, and worthy and generous deſigns.

For if I know my own thoughts (and I think no man knows them better) it was not a diſputing humour, nor an affectation of Fame and Glory, which gave birth to that Diſcourſe: Popular errors are a more likely way to procure a popular eſteem, than deſpiſed and perſecuted truths; and though the judgment of the wiſe is more valuable, yet the opinion of the people gives a name; as Dr. *Owen* very well obſerves from his own experience, that his reputation is ſecured by the cry and vogue of a Faction, when his Arguments are baffled, and practiſes expoſed. Vind. p. 5.

And there is nothing I am more averſe to, than a diſputing humour; there are very few opinions, which I think worth contention; while the general concernments of Religion and a good Life are ſecured, I can be contented, that men ſhould differ in ſome nicer ſpeculations, and it is a folly to be diſcontented at it, for they always will, and there is no hurt in it: There are five hundred curious queſtions ſtarted by ſome wanton wits, which can never be determined, and it is no matter, whether they be or not; but whatever opinions have a bad influence upon mens lives, are deſtructive to their ſouls too; and it becomes every man, who hath any concern for the eternal welfare of mankind, to oppoſe ſuch dangerous miſtakes.

And this was the true occaſion of my writing that Diſcourſe; for the principal Doctrines, which I there oppoſe, are ſuch, as according to the beſt judgment I can make of them, do either expreſly, or in their immediate conſequences, encourage men to be bad; and if I am not miſtaken in it (as I ſee no reaſon yet to think I am) it was the moſt charitable deſign I could undertake; and if I be, though my Adverſaries may reaſonably condemn me for imprudence or ignorance, yet they ought

in

in juſtice to commend my Charity: And indeed, let it prove how it will, I cannot but foreſee ſome good effect of it; for thoſe who have any care of their ſouls, muſt either reject ſuch Doctrines, as are deſtructive of a good Life, or more expreſly declare for the neceſſity of a good Life, notwithſtanding ſuch Doctrines; and either way I have my end; ſo this Concluſion be univerſally received, whatever the Premiſes be: though this laſt I think is much the worſt way, it being dangerous to intruſt men with bad principles, for then they will draw Concluſions for themſelves; and moſt men are very ſagacious to diſcover ſuch conſequences as will ſerve their intereſt, and patronize their luſts.

This I have often obſerved in converſing with ſeveral ſorts of men, that they were very well skild in all thoſe principles which tended to looſneſs and debauchery, and that they underſtood the conſequences of them too well, and did at all turns make uſe of them to apologize for their own and other mens vices, who were accounted gracious perſons; the impoſſibility of keeping Gods Laws was their excuſe, and the righteouſneſs of Chriſt their refuge; the one leſſened their guilt, and

the other covered it; and I found, that let St. *John* say what he would, they had found out *a way to be righteous without doing righteousness.*

Nay I observed farther, that too many were grown so fond of these Notions, that they were impatient to hear any Preacher, who instructed them in their Duty, and prest the necessity of a holy Life, unless he concluded comfortably with a Caution not to trust in their Duties, nor to expect that God would be ever the better pleased with them upon that score, but that they must hope to be saved only by the Righteousness of Christ, which (however it was intended by the Preacher) I found was too often expounded by the Hearers, as a *Gospel-Use*, which relaxt the Rigor and Severity of that *Legal Doctrine* of the necessity of Good Works.

And it was too evident, that their Preachers did very much contribute to, and encourage this humour, as the last refuge of their sinking Cause: all their pretences for Separation had been notoriously baffled and shamed, and they were reduced to that case, that they could dispute no longer; and therefore the most effectual way they could take, was to perswade the People, that Christ and the Gospel were con-

confined to a Conventicle, and to declaim againſt thoſe *Moral Preachers*, who made it their conſtant buſineſs to perſwade men to live well, and urged this, as the moſt material and neceſſary part of Religion, and the great end of Chriſts coming into the World: A ſtrange and unpardonable crime, that a Miniſter of the Goſpel ſhould preach up good Works! and yet this is the great reproach that is caſt upon the City-Clergy, (and I thank God, that there is ſo much reaſon for it) this makes theſe men jealous of the Honour of Chriſt, and the Grace of God, as if there would not be ſins enough for Chriſt to expiate, and for the grace of God to pardon, unleſs men continued wicked: This occaſioned that great out-cry againſt a late excellent Book to prove that *Holineſs is the Deſign of Chriſtianity*, that the great end of what Chriſt hath done and ſuffered for us, is, to transform us into the nature of God, and thereby to qualifie us for the eternal fruition of him; as if this were too mean a deſign for the Son of God to effect, or there could be any thing more great and honourable, or the Salvation of Mankind could be obtained without it.

So that indeed I was not the firſt Aſſailant, but writ in the defence of a holy life,

which was cried down by these men either under the name of *Morality*, or of a *Legal Righteousness*, and in justification of those pious and truly Gospel-Preachers, who were scandalized and reproached as great Enemies to Christ, and the Grace of God, without any other pretence than their great Zeal and vigorous Endeavours to convince men of the necessity and advantages of a good Life.

It has bin the artifice of such men in all times to reproach the Loyal and Conformable Clergy; formerly they were a company of *dumb Dogs* and *Idol Shepherds*, because they were not every day in the Pulpit; but since their industrious and conscientious Labours have confuted that calumny, now they quarrel with them for preaching so well, for directing all their discourses to the advancement of true Piety and a practical Religion; without which Preaching can serve no end but to wheadle and cajole the People, and to maintain and promote a Faction.

Their pretences indeed for this are glorious and popular, that Christ is not preached, nor the grace of God sufficiently advanced in the Work of our Redemption; this were really a very great fault, if it were true, and such as does unchristian those

those men who are guilty of it; and therefore the great design of my Book was to wipe off this reproach, to show what it is to know Christ, and to preach him, to explain those Metaphors whereby Christ is described, and to reconcile the necessity of Holiness with the Doctrine of Christs Merits and Satisfaction, and Imputation of his Righteousness; and withal to make it appear, that some, who glory so much in preaching Christ, have made a very false representation of him, and out of a pretended veneration to the *Person* of our Saviour, have thrust his *Gospel* out of the World, or made such a Nose of Wax of it, as to serve any purpose but that, for which it was first designed.

And since my Adversaries have endeavoured to misrepresent the Doctrine and Design of my Book, and by affixing ill names to it, deter their followers from looking on the inside, or once considering what it is they are afraid of; I shall here give a short Abstract of the whole Doctrine, and do earnestly beg that favour of every man, if he will not be at the trouble to read and consider the *Discourse* it self, at least to peruse this short Account of it, before he allow himself the liberty of reviling.

Only

Only I must observe by the way, how the state of things is already altered since the appearing of my Discourse; before, the great noise and clamour was against Moral and Legal Preachers, who preach'd up Holiness, but left out Christ and the Grace of God; now when they are charg'd on the other hand with as much undervaluing a holy Life, and with advancing the Person of Christ to the prejudice of his Laws and Religion, they change their note, and would perswade the world, that there is no real difference between us, but that I force their Expressions to a sense which they never intended; they are now grown great Patrons of Holiness, and whatever they talk of the Excellency of Christs Person, or of his boundless and bottomless compassion, and of such an infinite mercy, which all the sins in the world cannot equal, and of such a Patience as will save us *notwithstanding our sins*, they mean no more, than what we believe, as heartily as they, that Christ is able and willing to save all those who repent, and believe, and reform their lives, and that he will save none but upon these terms: I am glad with all my heart to hear this, for I designed no more than to establish this Doctrine; but what account can they

give

give after this of their general out-cry against Legal and Moral Preachers? Were there any men who taught the People that Holineſs would ſave them without the Merits of Chriſt? I know no ſuch, they were none of my Companions and Complices, at whom the Doctor ſo often flurts.

And if there be no real difference between us, but only a different phraſe and manner of expreſſion, I wonder why they ſhould be ſo angry with thoſe men, who ſpeak that ſo plainly, that the People cannot miſtake them, which they affect to obſcure in uncouth and myſtical phraſes: There can be no account given of this, but that they are willing, at leaſt, that the People ſhould believe there is a difference; and are not ſo faithful to Mens Souls as to prevent ſuch dangerous miſtakes.

Were theſe phraſes of *coming to Chriſt*, and *cloſing with Chriſt*, and *leaning and reſting and rolling our Souls on Chriſt for Salvation*, and ſuch like, generally underſtood, (not only by ſome cunning Sophiſters, when they are forc'd by reaſon and argument to put a ſober ſenſe on them, but by the common people) to ſignifie no more than expecting to be ſaved by Chriſt according to Goſpel-terms, that is, upon the conditions of Faith

and

and Repentance, and a new Life, I ſhould think him very ill imployed, who ſhould diſturb the peace of the Church for the ſake of any modes of ſpeaking; but when it is ſo evident, that the Preachers themſelves, when they have no adverſary, expound theſe phraſes to a very different, if not contrary purpoſe; and that the generality of Hearers never ſuſpect that coming to Chriſt, and cloſing with Chriſt, include Obedience and a holy Life; but that this is rather a hinderance to their cloſing with Chriſt, as their Preachers tell them: This makes it neceſſary to oppoſe thoſe forms of ſpeech which are generally abuſed to evil purpoſes, and it is an argument of no great honeſty, to be fond of words and phraſes to the prejudice of mens ſouls.

And yet after all this, the Doctor cannot forget his old grudge againſt theſe Preachers of holineſs: He tells us, *I know there are not a few, who in the courſe of a vain worldly converſation, whilſt there is ſcarce a back or belly of a Diſciple of Chriſt that bleſſeth God upon account of their bounty or charity (the footſteps of levity, vanity, ſcurrility, and prophaneſs, being moreover left upon all the paths of their haunt) are wont to declaim about holineſs, good works, and juſtification by them, which is a*

Vin. p. 119

*ready way to inſtruct men to Atheiſm, or the ſcorn of every thing that is profeſſed in Religion.* No doubt but there is a great mixture of truth and modeſty in this cenſure; I thank God I know no ſuch perſons, and if I did, I ſhould abhor them as much, as he can: but the Doctors quarrel ſeems to be not ſo much at the *vanity and prophaneſs*, &c. *of their Converſation*, (for it is a known Maxim among them, *The worſe the better*) as at their preaching Holineſs, *&c.* Good Sir, if ſuch men are permitted to preach, what would you have them preach? Should they cry down holineſs, and preach up debauchery? Is this the way to cure the world of Atheiſm? Or ſhould they teach men to truſt wholly in the righteouſneſs of Chriſt, without any righteouſneſs of their own? I confeſs, this would much more become them; and I wonder all bad men are not of this perſwaſion, though I hope the Doctor and his Friends have ſome better reaſon for their Zeal.

For the ſame cauſe theſe men perſecute my Diſcourſe, the whole deſign of which is no more than to convince men of the abſolute neceſſity of a univerſal Righteouſneſs in order to pleaſe God, and to ſave their ſouls; that no man muſt expect to be ſaved by Chriſt without obeying the Goſpel,

Goſpel, and imitating the example of his Lord; and that this is the meaning of all thoſe phraſes of Scripture, of *believing in Chriſt, and coming to him, and receiving him, and being united to him, and ingrafted in him*, and the like, which are expounded by ſome men to the prejudice of obedience, and to encourage ſinners to expect juſtification by Chriſt (and thoſe who are juſtified, are actually in a ſtate of ſalvation) while they are in their filth and impurities.

I cannot but think it very glorious to ſuffer in ſuch a cauſe; this was the very reaſon, why the Phariſees perſecuted our Saviour himſelf, becauſe he rejected all their external and ceremonial righteouſneſs, and exacted from them a ſincere and internal obedience to the divine Laws; and plainly told them, That nothing would carry them to Heaven, but ſuch a renovation of their minds and ſpirits as transformed them into the likeneſs and image of God: This is the great fault of my Book, and the true reaſon of all this noiſe and clamour, as will appear by taking a ſummary account of the whole Deſign, and Doctrine of it.

CHAP.

## CHAP. I.

*Containing a ſhort Account of the Deſign and Doctrine of the Diſcourſe concerning the Knowledge of Chriſt, &c.*

THE Deſign I propoſed to my ſelf in that Diſcourſe, was to reconcile that Love and Honour and Adoration, Truſt and Affiance, which all Chriſtians owe to their Lord and Saviour, with the neceſſity of obeying his Laws, and being conformed to his Example; that eſteem and reverence we owe to the Perſon of Chriſt, with a reverence for his Laws; that no man might expect to be ſaved by Chriſt, though he be infinitely gracious and compaſſionate, and inherit all the boundleſs Perfections of the Deity, without the practice of an univerſal Righteouſneſs. And therefore I ſhowed that all thoſe Conſiderations *chap. 2.* which did naturally reſult from the contemplation of the Perſon of Chriſt, as he is the Eternal Son of God, who was made Man,

Man, and ſent into the World to accompliſh the work of our Redemption, did neceſſarily engage us to obey his Laws, but gave us no encouragement to expect any thing more from him upon his Perſonal account, than what he hath promiſed in his Goſpel.

"This (I obſerved) was a plain demon-
"ſtration of Gods love to Mankind, that
"he ſent ſo great and ſo dear a Perſon as
"his only begotten Son, to ſave Sinners:
"——No man can doubt of Gods good
"will to Sinners, who ſees the Son of God
"cloathed with our fleſh, and dying as a
"Sacrifice for our ſins; and this gives re-
"lief to our guilty fears, and encourages
"us to retrieve our paſt follies by new
"Obedience. No man will return to his Duty without ſome hope of Pardon and Forgiveneſs for his paſt ſins; and the proper uſe of Gods love in ſending Chriſt into the World, is to conquer our Obſtinacy, and to encourage our Hopes.

Thus the greatneſs of Chriſts Perſon gives great Reverence and Authority to his Goſpel, and an inviolable Sanction to his Laws, as the Apoſtle argues; *If the word ſpoken by Angels was ſtedfaſt, and every tranſgreſſion and diſobedience received a juſt recompence of Reward, how ſhall we eſcape if we neglect*

*neglect ſo great ſalvation, which at firſt began to be ſpoken by the Lord,* ? Heb. 1. 2, 3.

And this gives great Authority to his Example, and lays forcible obligations on us to imitate him, who was not only our Saviour, but God incarnate.

"And this aſſures us of the infinite va-
"lue of his Sacrifice, and of the power
"of his Interceſſion: God cannot but be
"pleaſed, when his own Son undertakes
"to be a Ranſom, and to make Atone-
"ment for ſinners, which is ſo great a
"vindication of Gods Dominion and
"Soveraignty, of the authority of his
"Laws, and the wiſdom and juſtice of his
"Providence, that he may ſecurely par-
"don humble and penitent ſinners with-
"out reproaching any of his Attributes;
"and we can deſire no greater ſecurity for
"the performance of this Goſpel-Cove-
"nant, than that it was ſealed with the
"blood of the Son of God.

And this is a great encouragement to return to God, when we have ſuch a powerful Advocate and Mediator to intercede for us.

"But then we muſt expect no more
"from Chriſt, upon account of his perſo-
"nal Excellencies and Perfections, than
"what he hath promiſed in his Goſpel.

"Chriſt is the object of our Faith and "Hope, only as he is our Saviour; and he "is our Saviour in no other ſenſe, than as "he is our Mediator; and he mediates for "us as our Prieſt, that is, in vertue of that "Covenant, which he hath ſealed with "his blood; and therefore we have no "reaſon to expect any thing from the "Perſon of Chriſt which is not contained "in his Covenant, much leſs, which con-"tradicts it; for that would be, in effect, "*to renounce his Mediation, and to truſt to the* "*goodneſs of his Nature.*

Chriſt will in his own Perſon accompliſh all thoſe, Promiſes he hath made, whether they concern the preſent aſſiſtances of his Grace, or his Providence and Protection in this world, or the future rewards of the next: but we muſt learn what Chriſt will do for us, and upon what terms, not from the boundleſs Perfections and Excellencies of his Perſon, but from the Declarations of the Goſpel, though the conſideration of his Perſon, who he is, and how he lived, and what he taught, may convince any man, that he will be a Saviour to none but thoſe who live in the practiſe of that Righteouſneſs, of which he was a Preacher and Example.

Now to ſilence the clamors of ſome men,

men, who upbraided those Preachers who spent their greatest zeal in expounding the Laws of Christ, and in pressing men by all the Motives and Arguments of the Gospel (the Sacrifice and Mediation of Christ, the necessity of a good Life to make men happy hereafter, and the many great advantages of Holiness here, *&c.*) to the practise of an universal Righteousness; I say, to silence the clamors of those, who upbraided such Preachers with not *preaching Christ*, I considered in the next place, what it is to *know Christ*, and so consequently, what it is to *preach Him*; and the sum of it was this, That to know Christ, is to be acquainted with that Revelation which Christ hath made of Gods will to the world: For as in former ages God made himself known by the light of Nature, and the works of Creation and Providence, and those partial and occasional Revelations of his Will, which he made to good men; now in these last days he hath sent his Son into the world, to declare his Will to us: And therefore the only useful knowledge is to understand those Revelations, which Christ hath made of Gods Will, the necessary consequence of which is, that he, who expounds the Laws and Doctrine of the Gospel, does in

*Discourse of the Knowledge of Christ, Chap. 3.*

the moſt proper ſenſe preach Chriſt, as *Philip* is ſaid to preach Chriſt to the *Samaritans*, Act. 8. 5. which in *ver.* 12. is called, *Preaching the things concerning the Kingdom of God, and the Name of Jeſus Chriſt*; that is, the whole Doctrine of the Goſpel.

The whole Chriſtian Religion is the Knowledge of Chriſt, and the Laws of Righteouſneſs, and the Motives to Obedience as principal a part as any, becauſe this was the ultimate deſign of Chriſts coming into the world to reform mens lives, and to prepare them for the happineſs of the next world, by transforming them into a Divine Nature: All that Chriſt did and ſuffered, was only in order to this end, and then we underſtand all thoſe myſteries of the Incarnation, and Death, and Interceſſion of Chriſt, as much as is neceſſary to the purpoſes of Religion; when we underſtand what obligations, they lay on us to a holy Life, and feel their power and vertue in renewing and ſanctifying our minds.

In the next place I obſerved, that the foundation of the greateſt and moſt dangerous miſtakes, was laid in a wrong notion of our *Union to Chriſt*, of which ſome men diſcourſe in ſuch uncouth and Cabbaliſtical terms, as no Body can underſtand,

ſtand, and therefore I endeavoured to ſtate the true notion of our Union to Chriſt, and Communion with him. chap. 4.

And the ſum of it is this, that thoſe Metaphors which deſcribe our union to Chriſt, do primarily refer to the Chriſtian Church, not to every individual Chriſtian; as Chriſt is the Head, and the Church or whole Society of Chriſtians his Body; a Husband, and the Church his Spouſe; a Shepherd, and the Church his Flock; a Rock, whereon his Church is built; the chief corner Stone, and the Church a holy Temple.

But as for particular Chriſtians, their Union to Chriſt is by means of their Union to the Chriſtian Church: that is, no man can be united to Chriſt, till he be a Chriſtian; and no man is in the Scripture account a Chriſtian, till he make a public profeſſion of his Faith, and be ſolemnly admitted into the Chriſtian Church, which is the Body of Chriſt, for which he died, and to which all the Promiſes of the Goſpel are made.

A ſecret and private Faith in Chriſt is not ordinarily enough to make any man a Chriſtian; but Faith in the Heart, and the Confeſſion of the Mouth are both neceſſary: *Rom.* x. 9, 10. Chriſt himſelf hath

appointed the publick Sacrament of our Initiation, and our Church teacheth her Children, that in their Baptiſm (which is their ſolemn admiſſion into the Chriſtian Church) *They are made Members of Chriſt, the Children of God, and Inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven.*

But I have abundantly confirmed this Notion in my former Diſcourſe, and thoſe who would be more fully ſatisfied in it, may have recourſe thither. The next thing to be conſidered is, what is the true nature of this Union betwixt Chriſt and his Church, and the moſt general and comprehenſive notion is, that it is a Political, not a natural Union: the Union between Chriſt and his Church conſiſts in their mutual Relations to each other; now thoſe Relations whereby the Scripture repreſents this Union, ſignifie Power and Authority on Chriſts part, and Inferiority and Subjection in the Church: Chriſt is the Head and Husband, which ſignifies Rule and Government; and the Church is his Spouſe and Body; and therefore as the Wife is ſubject to the Husband, and the Body to the Head, ſo the Church muſt be ſubject to Chriſt; and the like may be ſaid of all thoſe other Relations, whereby this Union is deſcribed.

Only

Only when I call it a Political Union, you must not imagine that it is only such an external Relation, as is between a Prince and his Subjects; because Christ is a spiritual King, and his Authority reaches to the Heart and Spirit, which no Humane Power can: no man is in a proper sence a Subject of Christs Kingdom, but he, who governs his Heart and Spirit, as well as his external Actions, by the Laws of the Gospel; and though an external and visible profession of the Gospel entitles men to an external Communion with the Christian Church, because the external Government of the Church is committed to men, who cannot discern hearts and thoughts; yet whoever does not heartily obey Christ, is not really united to him; for the subjection of the Mind and Spirit is the principal thing which denominates us the Subjects of a spiritual King: and therefore this may be called a Spiritual-Political Union, which principally respects the Subjection of our Minds and Spirits to Christ, and does necessarily include a participation of the same nature with him, and a mutual & reciprocal love: It is a Political Union because it consists in the Authority and Government of Christ as a Head and Husband, and in the

Subjection and Obedience of the Church, as his Body and Spouſe: and it is Spiritual, becauſe the Authority of Chriſt does not only reach our Outward Actions, as the Government of Earthly Princes does, but extends it ſelf to our Minds and Spirits: and if you will put it into other words, our Union to Chriſt conſiſts in a hearty belief of his Revelations, in obedience to his Laws, and ſubjection to his Authority, this makes us the Church the Temple of God, wherein he dwells, as he formerly did in the Temple at *Jeruſalem*; this is that which the Scripture calls having Fellowſhip and Communion with God and Chriſt, which ſignifies being of that Society, which puts us into a peculiar relation to God, that God is our Father, and we his Children; that Chriſt is our Head and Husband, our Lord and Maſter, we his Diſciples and Followers, his Spouſe and his Body: this entitles us to his Merits and Righteouſneſs, to his peculiar Care and Providence, to the Influences of his Grace, to the Power of his Interceſſion, to all thoſe bleſſings, which he hath purchaſed for, and promiſed to his Church.

Now beſides that this Notion is plain and intelligible, and very aptly agrees with

with all those Metaphors and Forms of Speech, whereby the Scripture represents our Union to Christ, there are these two great advantages we gain by it: first that this is a plain demonstration of the evil and danger of Schism, a sin which very few men have any sense of in these days; for if our Union to Christ as our Head, necessarily requires our Union to the Christian Church, which is his Body, then to divide from the Christian Church, or any true and sound part of it, does not only make a Rent in the Body of Christ, which is a very great evil, but divides us from Christ; as a Member, which is separated from the Body, is separated from the Head too: this makes the Sentence of Excommunication so dreadful, because it cuts us off from the Body of *Christ*; and this Sentence every Schismatick executes upon himself, and that more infallibly too than Church-Governours can; for they may be mistaken in the Justice of the Cause, and may separate those from the external Communion of the Church, who are spiritually united to Christ, and then their Sentence is reverst by a superior Tribunal: But whoever causlesly separates from the Christian Church, or any part of it, does infallibly divide himself from Christ,

Christ, unless it be through such invincible mistakes, as may mitigate the crime, and plead his excuse; for Schism is a work of the flesh, the effect of Pride, and Passion, or Interest, or some other carnal Lust; and it concerns those men, who make so light of Schism, to consider, how they expect to be saved by Christ, who is only the Saviour of the Body, when they have divided themselves from his Body, and are no longer any part or member of it.

A second advantage, which we gain by this notion, is this, that it gives a plain account of the necessity of Holiness and Obedience to entitle us to the Merits of Christ, and Justification by him, and to all those Promises, which Christ hath made to his Body and Members; whoever is in Christ, and united to him, shall certainly be saved by him; for he is the Saviour of the Body; and our Justification is not owing to our own Merits and Deserts, but to the Merits of Christ, for whose sake alone, God hath promised to justifie and reward those, who are united to him; but since our Union to Christ consists in the subjection of our Souls and Bodies to him, Holiness and Obedience is as necessary a condition of our Justification by Christ, as it

is eſſential to our Union to him: We cannot be juſtified by Chriſt, till we are united to him, and we are not united to him, till we obey him: this gives the glory of all to Chriſt, becauſe we are juſtified for his ſake, by vertue of our Union to him, and yet vindicates the neceſſity of a holy Life, becauſe this is eſſential to our Union to Chriſt.

And this is the ſum of whatever I aſſerted concerning the Neceſſity of Good Works to our Juſtification; not that they can merit any thing of God, but that they are the neceſſary conditions of the Covenant of Grace, which was purchaſed and ſealed by the Blood of Chriſt; or in other words, that they are neceſſary to our Union with Chriſt, and thereby to give us an intereſt in all thoſe Promiſes of Pardon, and Grace, and Eternal Life, which Chriſt hath made to his Church. The Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is our Righteouſneſs, when we ſpeak of the Foundation of the Covenant, by which we are accepted; but if we ſpeak of the terms of the Covenant, then we muſt have a Righteouſneſs of our own, not to merit Juſtification or Eternal Life, but to entitle us to the Grace and Mercy of the New Covenant, or which is all one, to unite us to

Chriſt,

Chriſt, by whom and for whoſe ſake we are juſtified: to ſay, that Obedience to the Laws of the Goſpel, a new Nature, and Holineſs of Life, are the neceſſary conditions of our Juſtification by Chriſt, and to ſay, that they are eſſential to our Union to Chriſt, by whom we are juſtified, are different forms of Speech, but ſignifie the ſame thing; becauſe Chriſt juſtifies none but thoſe, who are united to him, and none are united to him but by Faith and Obedience; and ſo *e converſo*, thoſe who believe and obey the Goſpel are in ſo doing united to Chriſt, and they, and none elſe, ſhall be juſtified by him: which gives a plain account, how the Virtue and Merit of all is due to Chriſt, becauſe we are juſtified by our relation to him; and explains the meaning of thoſe phraſes of *receiving Chriſt, and coming to him for Life and Salvation, and believing in him*; which ſignifies our being united to him by a ſincere Faith and Obedience, which is neceſſarily required of all thoſe, who would be juſtified by him.

In the laſt Chapter I give a ſhort account of the nature of Chriſts love to us, and of our love to Chriſt, that no man might miſtake the love of Chriſt for a fond and eaſie paſſion, nor think to pleaſe him with ſome heats

heats and raptures of Fancy, inſtead of the ſubſtantial Returns of Duty and Obedience: the ſum of which in ſhort is this; that Chriſt expreſſed a wonderful and ſtupendious Love in dying for us, eſpecially in dying for us, while we were his Enemies; upon which account the Scripture every where magnifies the love of Chriſt: but though this were the greateſt, yet it is not the only expreſſion of his love, but he manifeſts the ſame good will in all the methods of his Grace and Providence: he is an eaſie and gentle Governour, who rules with the natural tenderneſs and compaſſion of a Shepherd, a Husband, a Head, a Friend: He pities our weakneſſes and infirmities, and is ready to help and ſuccour us; he is now aſcended up to Heaven, where he perſonally intercedes for us, and with his own hand diſpences all thoſe Bleſſings to us, which we want, and pray for in his Name. And he who loved Sinners ſo as to die for them, muſt needs take pleaſure in good men, and dwell with them as one Friend dwells with another, *John* xiv. 21, 23. Chriſt will in a more eſpecial manner be preſent with ſuch good men, who are careful in all things to obey him, and will give very ſenſible demonſtrations of his preſence with them, *will manifeſt himſelf*

*himſelf unto them, and make his abode with them.*

And now in return to this, we muſt conſider that Chriſt is our Superiour, our Lord, and Maſter, and therefore our love to Chriſt muſt not expreſs it ſelf in a fond and familiar paſſion, ſuch as we have for our Friends and Equals, but in a great Reverence and Devotion. Superiors muſt be treated with Honour and Reſpect, and therefore our love to our Parents and Superiors in the Fifth Commandment is called *Honour*; and the ſame religious Affection to God, which is ſometimes called Love, is at other times called Fear, which ſignifies a *Reverential Love*, or a Love of Honour, Reverence, and Devotion: and therefore the external Expreſſions of our love to our Saviour are as various, as the Expreſſions of Honour, and muſt bear ſome reſpect to the nature and condition of the Perſon, and that relation we ſtand in to him: Chriſt being the only begotten Son of God, we muſt have regard to the Greatneſs and Excellency of his Perſon: Since he became Man, and died for us, we muſt admire and praiſe his Goodneſs: He being our Mediator and Advocate, we muſt truſt and confide in him, and expect the returns of our Prayers, and all other

Bleſ-

Bleſſings, from the prevalency of his Interceſſion: He being our Prophet and Lawgiver, we muſt expreſs our Love to him in a belief of his Goſpel, and a ſincere Obedience to his Laws; as Chriſt requires of his Diſciples, *If you love me, keep my Commandments*: And when we conſider our Saviour, as our *Guide and Example*, the trueſt expreſſion of our Love and Honour is *to imitate him, to live as he lived in the World*: And that, which perfects our Love, is an undaunted Courage and Reſolution in profeſſing the Faith of Chriſt, whatever Dangers and Miſeries, it may expoſe us to in this world: *For there is no fear in love, but perfect love caſteth out fear.* Theſe are the proper expreſſions of our love to Chriſt, which are ſummarily comprehended in believing his Goſpel, and obeying it; for to be a true Lover of Chriſt, ſignifies neither more, nor leſs, than to be a good Chriſtian.

This is a faithful account of the Deſign and Doctrine of my Book, which hath raiſed ſo much Noiſe and Clamour, and hath ſharpened the Pens and Tongues of ſo many againſt me; but it is a vain attempt to think to out-face the Sun; theſe are ſuch bright and glorious Truths as will out-ſhine all the New Lights of preſent or former

formet Ages, and command belief from all honeſt and inquiſitive Minds, by their own natural Evidence.

The Doctrines, which I deſignedly oppoſed in that Diſcourſe, are ſuch as contradict theſe great Truths, or at leaſt ſuch, as I apprehended to do ſo, either expreſly, or in their immediate conſequences; and becauſe this is the principal thing, which has anger'd ſo many men, whoſe Cauſe and Reputation are concerned in the quarrel, I ſhall give ſome brief account, what thoſe Doctrines are, and in what ſence I reject them, which I hope may ſilence thoſe ſcandalous reports, as if I had ſtruck at the very foundations of Chriſtianity.

And firſt whereas I obſerved, that to know Chriſt, ſignifies the belief and knowledge of thoſe Revelations which Chriſt hath made to the World, which includes whatever he hath revealed to us concerning his own Perſon, Natures, Mediation, and the whole Will of God concerning our Salvation, which muſt be learnt from the expreſs Declarations of the Goſpel, not from ſome fanciful and imaginary conſequences, which is a very unſafe way in matters of pure Revelation; Doctor *Owen* hath advanced an *Acquaintance with the*

*the Perſon of Chriſt*, as the only Medium of ſaving knowledge; that is, when we have from the Goſpel learnt, who Chriſt is, what he hath done and ſuffered for us; when we have learnt thoſe things, which concern his *Perſon*, *Offices*, *and Work*, we may then give free ſcope to our fancies, and draw ſuch concluſions, as are no where expreſly contained in Scripture, or could not poſſibly have been learnt from Scripture, at leaſt not *clearly and ſavingly*; without ſuch an Acquaintance with the Perſon of Chriſt, that is, without reaſoning and drawing concluſions from what Chriſt hath done, & ſuffered. Theſe concluſions muſt be formed into artificial Theories, and Schemes of Religion, and then theſe are the great Goſpel-Myſteries, and the only ſaving knowledge of Chriſt: and thoſe men only preach Chriſt, who fill peoples heads with ſuch choice Speculations, as they have learnt from this Acquaintance with Chriſt.

I thought there was very great reaſon to oppoſe this Principle, which gave ſuch boundleſs ſcope to mens fancies, and allowed every man to frame and mold a Religion according to his own humour; and was the more confirmed in this, when I obſerved what ſtrange Myſteries the Do-

&or himſelf had learn'd from this Acquaintance with Chriſt, which I am ſure without this, he could never have learnt either from Scripture or Reaſon; I gave ſeveral inſtances of this nature out of his own Writings, which ſhall be made good in due time; at preſent I muſt obſerve what Doctrines I there reject, and in what ſence.

I rejected ſuch a notion of Gods Juſtice, as repreſents him as fierce and ſavage as the worſt of beings; ſuch a notion of Juſtice as diſparages the Satisfaction of Chriſt, as if the whole deſign of it were to gratifie Revenge, and to appeaſe a furious and mercileſs Deity; which notion at firſt frighted *Socinus* out of his Wits, and made him rather chuſe to deny the ſatisfaction of Chriſt, than to believe any thing ſo unworthy of God; though thanks be to God, that we need do neither.

I reject ſuch a notion of Juſtice, as diſparages the Wiſdom of God in the contrivance of our Redemption by Jeſus Chriſt: for if it were abſolutely neceſſary for God to puniſh ſin, and there were no other Perſon in the World fit or able to bear the puniſhment of ſin, and to make expiation for it, but only Chriſt, there was required no great Wiſdom to make the choice.

I reject ſuch a notion of the Mercy and Patience of God, as repreſents it to be the effect only of the ſatisfaction of Revenge, which is like the tameneſs of an angry man, when his paſſion is over, which is an unworthy conceit of the infinite Love and Goodneſs of the Divine Nature.

I reject ſuch a notion of Mercy, as repreſents God to be fond & eaſie to Sinners, while they continue ſo; and I think ſuch a notion of Juſtice and Mercy very unworthy of God, which repreſents him more concerned to puniſh Sin, than to reform it: And is it not hard, that a man muſt be ſcandalized with denying the ſatisfaction of Chriſt, and blaſpheming God, meerly for rejecting ſuch Doctrines, as are injurious to the Satisfaction of Chriſt, and when they are purſued to their juſt and natural conſequences, are down right blaſphemy againſt God: this is a certain way to prevent the confutation of ſuch Doctrines, for you cannot confute them without diſcovering their blaſphemy, and whoever does ſo, ſhall himſelf be charged as a Blaſphemer.

But to proceed, I reject ſuch a notion of our Union to the Perſon of Chriſt, as is unintelligible, ſuch as the Great Patrons *Chap. 4. Sect. 2.*

of it cannot explain, nor any one elſe underſtand; for ſince all our hopes of Salvation depends upon our Union to Chriſt, I can by no means think, that this is ſuch a Myſtery, as ſurpaſſes humane knowledge; for that on which the happineſs of all men depends, ought in reaſon to be ſo plain, that it may be underſtood by all.

I reject ſuch a notion of our Union to the Perſon of Chriſt, as intitles us to all the Perſonal Excellencies, Fulneſs, Beauty, and to the Perſonal Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, as much as Marriage intitles a Woman to her Husbands Eſtate: that whatever Chriſt hath done and ſuffered is as much reckoned ours, when we are united to him, as if we had done and ſuffered the ſame things our ſelves; and that upon this account we are juſtified only by the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, without reſpect to any inherent Righteouſneſs in our ſelves.

Now I reject this, becauſe no Union can thus intitle us to Chriſts perſonal Excellencies and Righteouſneſs, but ſuch a natural Union as makes Chriſt and Believers *One Perſon*, that they are *Chriſted with Chriſt*, which is an abſurd and dangerous Hereſie; but neither our Marriage to Chriſt, nor his being our Surety, or Mediator, can effect this;

this; for whatever Union there may be between the Perſon of Chriſt and the Perſons of Believers, while their Perſons remain diſtinct, their Properties and Qualifications and Righteouſneſs muſt be conſidered as diſtinct too; and though we may receive great advantage by what Chriſt hath done and ſuffered, yet it cannot be reckoned ours, in that ſtrict notion, as if it had been done by us: and there is a vaſt difference between theſe two notions; for the firſt only makes the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt the meritorious cauſe of our Pardon and Reward, which makes it neceſſary to have a Righteouſneſs of our own to entitle us to theſe Bleſſings; but the ſecond makes the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt our Perſonal Righteouſneſs, which deſtroys the neceſſity of any inherent Righteouſneſs in our ſelves; but of this more hereafter.

I reject ſuch a notion of our Union to Chriſt, whereby bad men may be, nay muſt be united to Chriſt, while they continue in their ſins: for if it once be granted (as it muſt be granted, if we believe the Goſpel) that our Union to Chriſt gives us an actual intereſt in all his Promiſes, ſuch as Pardon of Sin, and Eternal Life; it is eaſie to obſerve how this overthrows

the whole Deſign of the Goſpel, if a bad man, while he continues ſo, may be united to Chriſt; for then he is a Son of God, and an Heir of Everlaſting Life; and what becomes then of all thoſe Goſpel-Threatnings, which denounce *the wrath of God againſt all unrighteouſneſs and ungodlineſs of men*? When Chriſt tells us, *That he who breaks the leaſt of his Commandments, ſhall be called leaſt in the Kingdom of Heaven; that except our righteouſneſs exceed the righteouſneſs of the Scribes and Phariſees, we ſhall in no wiſe enter into the Kingdom of Heaven*: and when St. *Paul* tells us, *The works of the fleſh are manifeſt, which are theſe, Adultery, Fornication, Uncleanneſs, Laſciviouſneſs, Idolatry, Witchcraft, Hatred, Variance, Emulations, Wrath, Strife, Seditions, Hereſies, Envyings, Murders, Drunkenneſs, Revellings, and ſuch-like, of the which I tell you before, as I have alſo told you in time paſt, that they which do ſuch things ſhall not inherit the Kingdom of God*, *Gal.* v. 19, 20, 21. I ſay, muſt theſe and ſuch-like places, which ſo expreſly denounce the wrath of God againſt all wickedneſs and impieties, be expounded with this limitation, that this ſhall be the portion of ſuch men, unleſs they be united to Chriſt, and thereby ſheltered from the wrath of God, as a Wife under covert is

ſecured

ſecured from all Arreſts at Law? But as ſoon as any man hath got into Chriſt, let him be what he will, he is redeem'd from the curſe of the Law, and made an Heir of Eternal Life: And does not this effectually evacuate all the Threatnings of the Goſpel, and ſet up the Perſon of Chriſt, as a Refuge and Sanctuary for the Ungodly, and make the Grace of Chriſts Perſon a Diſpenſation from his own Laws and Threatnings? I am ſure the Apoſtle underſtood not this limitation, as is plain from what he adds verſ. 24, *And they that are Chriſts have crucified the fleſh, with the affections and luſts.* And in *Rom.* viii. 1. *There is no condemnation to them which are in Chriſt Jeſus*; and that we might not miſtake him, he expreſly tells us, whom he means, *who walk not after the fleſh, but after the Spirit:* This is eſſential to our Union to Chriſt, and to entitle us to the Grace of the Goſpel.

And it is not enough to ſay, that Chriſt will ſave none, but thoſe who do live very holy lives, becauſe there is no reaſon for this ſaying: for if men are united to Chriſt before they are holy, their very Union to Chriſt gives them a title to eternal Life, and this can never be reconciled with the antecedent neceſſity of Holineſs,

which the Goſpel inculcates, not only to qualifie us for actual Salvation, but to give us a right to it: and therefore I had good reaſon to reject this notion of Union, unleſs I would renounce the whole Goſpel.

I reject ſuch a notion of Union, as makes it impoſſible for any man to know, either how to get into Chriſt, or whether he be in Chriſt or not; and I think every man, who values the ſalvation of his ſoul, or the peace and comfort of his own mind, hath reaſon to reject this too.

I reject ſuch a notion of Sanctification, as makes it impoſſible to diſtinguiſh a ſanctified from an unſanctified ſtate.

I reject ſuch a notion of Chriſts love to us as repreſents it too like a fond and fooliſh paſſion, as reſpects the very Perſon, without regard to any Qualifications in him, whether he be a fit object of love or not, which is ſo great an imperfection in humane love, that I cannot imagine it to be the perfection of a Divine Love.

And I reject ſuch a notion of the immutability of Chriſts love, as ſin it ſelf cannot alter, which is contrary to all the Declarations of his Goſpel, and inconſiſtent with the Holineſs and Purity of his Nature.

I reject such a notion of our love to Christ, as excludes all respect to the infinite love of Christ, and those numerous Benefits, we receive by him; which the Scripture assigns as the true reason of our love to Christ.

I reject such a notion of love to Christ, as excludes all regard to our own Happiness and Salvation by him, and must make us contented to be damned, and eternally separated from him; which is not only impossible to humane Nature, but contrary to the Principles of Christianity.

I reject such a notion of our love to Christ, as opposes our Love to Christ to our Duty and Obedience to him, which is the most proper and natural expression of our love of him; such a love as consists only in some flights of fancy and imagination, in admiring and valuing the *Person of Jesus Christ*, and in preferring him above all Legal Righteousness, and blamelessness of Conversation, and Duties upon Conviction; and in using all Duties and Ordinances only to *have us over to Christ*, for Righteousness and Salvation, and whatever we need; for this is no better than to set up the *Person* of Christ in opposition to his *Laws and Religion*.

This

This is a ſhort and plain account of the whole Doctrine and Deſign of my late Diſcourſe, and the more I conſider it, the leſs reaſon I ſee to repent of my Undertaking: The Doctrines I have profeſſedly taught, are the moſt neceſſary and uſeful Doctrines of Chriſtianity, and ſo plain and evident, that a younger man than my ſelf may defend them againſt the oldeſt Sophiſter: And the Doctrines that I have oppoſed, are as certainly falſe, as the other are true. That ſuch Doctrines have been taught, I have made it ſufficiently evident already, by the expreſs Teſtimonies of ſome late Writers, and becauſe Doctor *Owen* is unwilling to own the charge, as far as he is concerned in it, I muſt be forced to make it good, in vindication of my own Honeſty, and that is all the trouble, which he has given me: Only I would deſire the Reader to obſerve, that ſince the Doctor diſowns the charge, he renounces ſuch Doctrines too, and that was all I deſigned; I have no perſonal quarrel with any man, and ſhould be glad to find them more Orthodox, than their expreſs words would ever ſuffer me yet to believe, they are; though I fear much that

that upon Examination it will appear, that I underſtood them too well, and that the Doctor is not willing to recant thoſe Doctrines, which he would ſeem to diſown: There is ſome reaſon to ſuſpect this, becauſe he is not willing to declare his ſenſe in plain words, but endeavours to avoid the blow by jugling and ſophiſtical Arts; as will appear in what follows.

---

CHAP.

## CHAP. II.

### *Containing an* ANSWER *to ſome Popular Exceptions.*

NExt to no Adverſary, the moſt deſirable thing is, to have a fair and ingenuous one; but this muſt never be expected, where men ſerve a Faction, which makes them try all ways, not to diſcover what is true, but how they may palliate their miſtakes, and maintain their Authority and Reputation.

It is my unhappineſs to fall into ſuch mens hands, who wanting better Weapons to defend their Cauſe, return to their old childiſh tricks of flinging ſtones and dirt: I am not ſo well skilled at this ſport, as to venture to engage with them, nor ſhall I envy them ſuch a Victory, which will coſt them ſome time and trouble to make themſelves clean again.

There are ſeveral familiar Topicks of Reproach, which ſuch men uſe, when they dare not directly engage in the Diſpute.

They

They have a peculiar Gift of discerning thoughts and intentions, and there never was any Book writ, which they could not answer, but it was writ with a very ill design. Thus the Doctor would perswade the world, that it has been the great design of late days, *to cavil at his Writings, and to load his Person with reproaches*, and accordingly, *that I principally intended my Book against himself, and his Book, because he was the Author of it, which* (as he says) *will at last prove to be its only guilt and crime*: What a mighty conceit has the Doctor of himself, to think that he is so considerable that so many men should make it their business to oppose him! He might have been quiet for ought I know, had he not been troublesome to others, and set up for the Great Champion of the Cause; and his former miscarriages might have been buried in silence, had he not forc'd men to publish them: But I assure him, as for my own part, that I did not principally design that Discourse against him, nor any other man, much less against any party; but against those foolish and absurd Doctrines (whoever were the first Inventers, or Patrons of them) which debauch the practise of Christianity, and turn the plain Revelations of the Gospel into unintelligible

*Vind.* p. 5.

P. 7.

My-

Myſteries. I envy no mans Reputation, when it is conſiſtent with the intereſt of Religion, nor do I think, that any mans Reputation ought to be ſo dear to us, as to forego the moſt uſeful and neceſſary Truths, rather than let the World know, that ſuch Men of Name and Renown have been in a miſtake.

*Speculum*, p. 55. But it may be the *Looking-Glaſs-Maker* may ſee more than other men, though there is ſome danger, leſt ſuch perſons ſhould draw other mens faces by the reflection of their own: however let us hear, what he has to ſay. And he very gravely proves, that my deſign could not be good, by ſeveral arguments.

For firſt, if it had, then *before I had charged any Opinion, I ought fairly to have ſtated, and candidly repreſented that Opinion*, but may not the want of this ſometimes be a defect in Skill, not a failure in Honeſty? Or elſe what will become of many of his good Friends, who are not much verſed in Logick, and never were acquainted with this knack of ſtating things fairly: But he adds, *This I ſeldom find him to do, and if I had ſaid, I never found him ſo to have done, I ſhould not lie, though perhaps I might be miſtaken*: Now I know not how to help him, only would adviſe him the next time to uſe his

Spectacles

Spectacles inſtead of a Looking-glaſs, and then I hope he may ſee better, and diſcover a great many things fairly ſtated.

Secondly, He ſays, *That I ought never to charge any man with thoſe conſequences of an Opinion, which I know to be diſowned, and diſavowed by him*: Now how this comes in, I cannot tell, for he has not the confidence to charge me with doing ſo, though he would willingly inſinuate that I do.

But the third is a heavy charge, *That I draw a bad ſenſe out of words which are capable of a good ſenſe, which is a great Sin againſt God and my Neighbour*: Now this I confeſs, is a great crime, if by *capable* he means, when according to the common acceptation of the words, and uſe of phraſes, and circumſtances of the place, and the avowed Doctrines and Principles of the Author, it appears to be intended otherwiſe; but when the phraſe is doubtful and ambiguous, and on purpoſe contrived ſo to conceal thoſe Doctrines, which cannot endure the clear and open light; or when thoſe expreſſions, which may be capable of a good ſenſe, are by a traditionary expoſition generally underſtood in a bad ſenſe, eſpecially if the bad ſenſe be moſt agreeable to the profeſſed Principles of the Writer, and ſuch phraſes be delivered without

without an expreſs caution againſt the bad ſenſe; in theſe caſes it is no fault to expound ſuch expreſſions to the worſt ſenſe; but a great charity to mens Souls to warn them againſt ſuch eaſie and obvious miſtakes.

But this is a great charge, and therefore let us hear how he proves it: He gives two inſtances of it, one with reſpect to Doctor *Owen*'s Doctrine concerning *an Acquaintance with Chriſts Perſon*: this I ſhall let paſs at preſent, becauſe I ſhall meet with it again in the Doctor; but his other inſtance, on which he inſiſts, is with reference to Mr. *Shephard*: I ſhow how impoſſible it is, according to ſome mens Principles, to diſcover our Union to Chriſt, and Juſtification by him by the marks of Sanctification, and among other things I obſerve, "That when they have a mind to "take down the confidence of men, who "are apt to preſume too ſoon, that their "condition is good, they do ſo magnifie "the attainments of Hypocrites, who "ſhall never go to Heaven, that it is im-"poſſible for any ſanctified man to do "more than a Hypocrite may do. This I make good by a large citation out of Mr. *Shephard*'s *Sincere Convert*: And here he firſt quarrels, that I ſay *ſome men do ſo*, and

and prove it only from Mr. *Shephard*. These men, I see, will never be pleased; sometimes they quarrel, that I name any body, and sometimes that I name no more: but I can assure this Gentleman, that this was not Mr. *Shephard*'s private Opinion, and shall make it good, when I find more of his Mind to require a proof of it.

The wrong which he supposes I have done Mr. *Shephard*, is this, That *I bring him in answering the Pleas of several Hypocrites for themselves, and then suppose the same man to make all these Pleas for himself, which is not fair or just*: "As for instance, the man ac-
"cused of Hypocrisie, or at least suspect-
"ed, pleads for himself, that he has re-
"formed those Vices he once lived in,
"that he prays often, that he fasts some-
"times, as well as prays, that he hears the
"Word of God, and likes the best Prea-
"chers, that he reads the Scriptures often,
"that he is grieved and sorrowful for his
"past sins, that he loves good men and
"their company, that he has more know-
"ledge than others, and keeps the Lords
"day strictly, and has many very good
"desires and endeavours to get to heaven,
"and performs all these Duties with Life
"and Zeal, and is constant and perseveres
"in godly courses, and is conscious to him-

"ſelf of his own Sincerity in all this, that "he does all this with a good heart for "God: That Mr. *Shephard* objects all this in the perſon of *one man*, whom he deſigns after all to prove a Hypocrite, is ſo evident, that nothing could excuſe our Author for ſuppoſing, that he ſpoke this in the perſons of ſeveral men, that one pleaded one thing for himſelf, and another another, but only his confeſſion, that he had not read the Book; and how far that will excuſe him, let others conſider. Mr. *Shephard* begins thus, *In what haſt thou gone beyond them that think they are rich, and want nothing, who yet are poor, and miſerable, and naked? Thou wilt ſay haply firſt, I have left my ſins I once lived in*, &c. So that this is but the *firſt* thing ſuch a man objects or pleads, which argues that the other pleas are made in the ſame perſon; and ſo he goes on in the ſame perſon, *But I pray; But I faſt; But I read the Scriptures*, &c. where *I* can refer to none but the Perſon, who firſt made this Plea; and *but* connects it with the former Pleas, and is deſign'd to take off the force of the preceding Anſwers, that though a Hypocrite might do ſome one good thing, yet he did not another, or if he did a ſecond or a third, yet at leaſt he did not do all thoſe good things which this poor man pleaded for himſelf. And

And indeed the way Mr. *Shephard* takes with this man, to prove that he either is, or may be a Hypocrite, is ſo common and familiar a practiſe, that I wonder very much at the ignorance, or at the honeſty of our Author in requiring a proof of it: It is an ordinary queſtion, *How far a Hypocrite may go, and yet miſs of Heaven*; and the common way of anſwering it, is the ſame, which Mr. *Shephard* takes, by conſidering what particular good thing has been done by bad men, and ſince ſome bad men may do one good thing, and ſome another, and there is no ſingle grace or vertue, but may be counterfeited by a Hypocrite; they put all the good things together, which were ever done by bad men, and this is the attainment of Hypocrites: as if becauſe a Hypocrite may do ſome one good thing, and continue a Hypocrite, therefore a man may do all the good things, which were ever done by any Hypocrites, and yet be a Hypocrite; and after this, it is impoſſible for any man to know, whether he be a Hypocrite or not, ſince there is no one good thing, that can be named, but ſome Hypocrite or other has either done it, or done ſomething like it.

And now after this, every man muſt

needs ſee how abſurd and impertinent that difference is between a regenerate and unregenerate man, which Mr. *Shephard* aſſigns, and which our Author defends; That *an unregenerate man, let him go never ſo far, do never ſo much, yet he lives in one ſin or other*: I readily grant, that this is a good mark, in it ſelf conſidered, of an unregenerate man, that whoever lives in any one ſin, is certainly an unregenerate man: but that he ſhould live in ſome one ſin, *who goes never ſo far, and does never ſo much*, is a wonderful thing to me; eſpecially when we conſider, what is meant by *going never ſo far*, and *doing never ſo much*, which has reſpect to what he had diſcourſed before of the attainments of Hypocrites; ſuch as the reformation of his former vices, an honeſt, ſmooth, innocent, blameleſs life, joyned with all the acts of Worſhip and Homage to God, prayer, faſting, reading, hearing, obſerving the Lords day, and perſeverance and ſincerity in all this; what thoſe ſins are, in which ſuch a man lives, is ſtrange to me, and all the *Philoſophy in the World will not cure my admiration*: and therefore Mr. *Shephard* did not think this an infallible ſign, but lays greater weight upon ſome more ſpiritual marks, *of being carried out of all Duties to Chriſt, and taking*

*taking up his Eternal Rest and Lodging in Christ only*, which are surer evidences of Grace than all that Legal Righteousness of good Works, which Hypocrites may counterfeit: but this our Author fairly passes over in silence.

Now though I know not how to excuse my self to the Reader already, for taking so much notice of such an Objector, who writes without reading the Books, which he defends, or scarce those which he answers, yet I cannot but divert my self a while with some few Remarks upon his Answers to the several Pleas.

Plea: *I have left my sins I once lived in, and am now no Drunkard, no Swearer, no Lyer, &c. Mark* (says our Author) *it is not supposed that he hath left all the sins he once lived in.* Nor is the contrary supposed, though *&c.* you know is of a very large signification; and an indefinite proposition, when the subject matter requires it, is equivalent to an universal; and so it must be here; for he, who pleads for his sincerity from the reformation of his former sins, must be supposed by his sins, to understand *all* his sins, unless he be a greater fool than a Hypocrite; for if forsaking sin be necessary, then forsaking all sin is as necessary, as to forsake any. It is well our Author

*Speculum*, p. 58.

Epiſtle to *Hiſtoria quinq; Articularis exarticulata.*

did not fall into Mr. *Hickman*'s hands, for he has declared againſt teaching his Adverſaries Logick.

Upon the ſecond Plea he obſerves, *That though a man live a blameleſs, innocent, honeſt, ſmooth life, yet if it be not ſo with relation to God and Men, and in every thing, his prayers may avail nothing.* Our Author is as fit a man to defend Mr. *Shephard*, as ever I met with, for their Underſtandings and Logick ſeem to be much of a ſize: What difference is there between being blameleſs *&c.* with reference to God and Men, and in every thing; and between being blameleſs in their lives, honeſt and innocent in their converſation with men, and devout Worſhippers of God, as thoſe are, who ſincerely and heartily pray to him. However if the prayers of ſuch men may avail nothing, he muſt prove it from ſome other Text than *Iſa.* i. 11. for thoſe Jews, whoſe Sacrifices God rejected, were not ſuch honeſt and innocent men.

Upon the next Plea, he obſerves, *That Hypocrites may faſt ſometimes*; yes no doubt, though I am but young, I am old enough to remember this; but what he adds, that this is enough to juſtifie Mr. *Shephard*. I doubt is not ſo true as the other; for though this has been too common an Art

of

of Hypocriſie, yet I am not willing to believe, that every one, who faſts, is an Hypocrite; much leſs, if he be an honeſt and innocent man. But whether they were the Scribes, or Phariſees, who faſted twice a week to devour Widows Houſes, I was not much concerned to enquire, we have ſeen Examples enough of both ſorts.

Upon the next Plea I aſſert, That to hear the Word with joy, and to believe it, which is the deſcription of the Stony Ground, had been a good ſign of Grace, if it had continued: And this is the fault our Saviour found in this Ground, that this ſudden Faith and Joy did not continue. What has he to object againſt this? Why then

*——Ultima ſemper*
*Expectanda dies homini eſt, ſanctuſque vocari*
*Ante obitum nemo, ſupremaque funera debet.*

That is, every man muſt expect his laſt hour, and cannot be called *holy*, till he dies. But why ſo pray? We cannot ſay indeed, that any man will perſevere, till we ſee him die well; but we may call any

man holy before, who lives holily: While he lives well, it is the beſt ſign of Grace in the World, and if he continue to do ſo, his ſign of Grace continues, but Perſeverance muſt crown all. Why does not our Author correct our Saviour, for telling thoſe new Converts, *If ye continue in my words, then ſhall ye be my Diſciples indeed?* *John* viii. 31. Why does he not correct the whole Goſpel, the language of which is, *He that continueth to the end ſhall be ſaved?*

Upon the next Plea, he has a learned Diſpute about the Phariſees Memories, which were better than any Concordance for the Hebrew Text; I know the Story, as well as he, and do not much matter, what the credit of it is; but is not this a wiſe reaſon why our Saviour did not name the Text in preaching to a promiſcuous Auditory, becauſe it may be ſome few great Rabbies knew where to find it, whereas the generality of the people are ſaid *not to know the Law.*

In the next place, he diſputes as learnedly whether *Judas hanged himſelf*, and I perceive this great Critick thinks every one muſt be as impertinent as himſelf, who cannot meet with the word *Judas*, or *hanged*, or the like, but whether it be to the

pur-

purpoſe or not, muſt diſpute the caſe whether *Judas* were hanged: for if he broke his Neck, or had drowned, or burnt himſelf, it had been all one to my purpoſe, and I was not diſpoſed to go out of my way, to purſue Feathers, and Butterflies.

Upon the next, he gravely obſerves, That *there are no good men but ſleep ſometimes, unleſs they be wiſer than the five wiſe Virgins.* We will allow him this, ſo they do not ſleep to let their Lamps go out, as the five fooliſh Virgins did.

On the next, he obſerves, That *it is a huge commendation of good Knowledge*, that I ſay, *If a good man have the keeping of it, it is never the worſe for him*; though if he think this any diſparagement to good Knowledge, I perceive he underſtands Rhetorick as little as Logick; or thinks his Readers underſtand neither.

On the next, when I ſay, *That keeping the Lords day ſtrictly, is one good thing, which doth well in the company of more*; he is afraid I forgot my ſelf and ſtumbled upon a *Puritanical* ſaying before I was aware; and adds, that notwithſtanding I thus commend a ſtrict obſervation of the Lords day, *I could like well enough of a Book of Sports*; the uncharitableneſs of which Cenſure, contrary

to

to the expreſs ſenſe of my words, I leave to be corrected by his own Conſcience, if he have any left.

And here our Author thinks fit to break off, for it was not ſafe to go any farther; thoſe other Pleas, which this poor man makes to defend himſelf againſt the imputation of Hypocriſie, are ſuch on which he dares not venture; as, *That he performs all theſe Duties with life and zeal; That he is conſtant, and perſeveres in godly courſes*; and that he is conſcious to himſelf of his Honeſty and Sincerity in all this, *that he does all with a good heart for God*; that is, out of a hearty Devotion to God, and Reverence for his Laws; and if ſuch a man may be a Hypocrite, no man can be ſure of his Sincerity.

Only upon this laſt, he obſerves, *That Mr. Shephard only ſays, That a man may think he hath a good heart to God, and yet deceive himſelf*: whereas *I wiſh he had ſaid, that a man, who thinks he hath a good heart to God muſt needs be miſtaken; and then I would ſay, the whole Doctrine concerning Marks and Evidences were at an end.* Now to make it appear, what a fair Adverſary I have of this Author, I ſhall tranſcribe this whole paſſage.

Object. *But ſome men are conſcious to themſelves*

*ſelves of their own hypocriſie, but I do all with a good heart for God.* Anſw. *So thou maiſt think of thy ſelf, and be deceived:* Upon this, I obſerve, *If this be an Objection, let a man have what marks he will, the Objection will ſtill be good; for after all it may be objected, that a man may be deceived in it, and think he hath theſe marks, when he hath them not:* And as a proof of this, Mr. *Shephard* adds, *There is a way that ſeemeth right to a man, but the end thereof is death; thou mayeſt live ſo, as to deceive thy ſelf and others, and yet prove an Hypocrite:* On which I obſerve, that the ſenſe of this argument is this, *As if becauſe ſome men may think themſelves good, who are in a bad way, no man could ever be ſure that he were in the right; and thus farewel all Evidences.* So that there is no need Mr. *Shephard* ſhould ſay, *that he who thinks he hath a good heart towards God, muſt needs be miſtaken,* in order to overthrow the Doctrine of Marks and Evidences; for if a man, who is conſcious to himſelf of his own ſincerity, that he hath a great reverence and regard for God in all his actions, *may* be deceived in it, it is ſufficient to deſtroy all Marks and Evidences. For if we cannot be ſure what the workings and motions, purpoſes and reſolutions, and habitual inclinations of our own Minds are, we can be ſure of no-

nothing: and if a man, who is as ſure of this, as inward ſenſe and feeling can make him, may be deceived, then there is no way to be ſure of it: this makes men as down-right Scepticks in the Doctrine of Marks and Evidences, as to deny the truth of our Senſes, or of our Faculties, does in Philoſophy.

That refined Hypocriſie, wherewith men deceive themſelves, does not conſiſt in ſuch an hypocriſie and deceitfulneſs of the heart, as conceals it ſelf from it ſelf, which is abſolutely impoſſible; but in a falſe and hypocritical Religion, when they think to pleaſe God by ſome exterior homage, or flattering Devotions, or coſtly or pompous Ceremonies, or by an Orthodox Faith, or counterfeit Reliances, or any other mode or form of Religion, without a ſincere Obedience to his Laws; the men know that they are Villains all this while, that they are guilty of notorious wickedneſs, as the Scribes and Phariſees were; but they flatter themſelves, that they may be very dear to God notwithſtanding this, either for the ſake of the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, or ſome hypocritical performances of their own: *Theſe are the ways, which ſeem right to a man, when the end thereof is death.*

This

This is the ſum of our Authors charge againſt me, for perverting mens words, and how he hath acquitted himſelf in it, let the Reader judge; and all the amends I ſhall require of him is, to turn his Looking-Glaſs upon himſelf, and to view his own face in it.

But there is one Argument ſtill behind, to prove, that I could have no good deſign in writing that Diſcourſe, and when I have anſwered that, I hope I may paſs at leaſt for a well-meaning man. And that is, *That I thruſt out my ſting againſt thoſe, who have written nothing (taken notice of by me) that can be ſuppoſed to hurt or hinder Godlineſs:* And though he mentions *thoſe*, he inſtances only in *one*, a fault, which at all turns he corrects in me; now ſuppoſe this were true, is there nothing fit to be corrected, but what has an immediate tendency to make men bad? Muſt men be ſuffered to play and toy with ſacred things; and proſtitute the moſt venerable Religion to mean and low conceits; and confound mens notions with myſtical and allegorical deſcriptions, and turn the vital parts of Religion, into a work of imagination and fancy? *Speculum*, p. 65.

This is the preſent caſe, for in this charge he refers to that ſhort reflection I make

make upon Mr. *Tho. Vincents Invitation of young Women to Chriſt*; and our Author tells us, *That the Exhortation is directed to his Hearers to chuſe Chriſt for their Husband*; It is ſo, but it is to his *She-Hearers* in particular, which is a very *ſpiritual* conceit; becauſe he knew that Women, not Men, wanted Husbands: He has in the ſame Pamphlet a diſtinct Exhortation to *young Men*, but does he invite *them* to chuſe Chriſt for their *Husband?* by no means; the conceit would not do there; for young Men are more for Wives than Husbands, and therefore his Exhortation to them is only to give God their Hearts; which is a plain confeſſion of guilt, that he had ſo debaſed and carnalized the notion of that *ſpiritual* Marriage between Chriſt and his Church, that it was not ſo properly applicable to men, as to Women, as if there were any regard to the difference of Sex in this Spiritual Marriage: Nay, which is ſtill more fulſome, the Exhortation is not only to *Women*, but to *young* Women, becauſe they generally have moſt mind to Husbands; and indeed it appears by his Exhortation, that this Sermon was deſigned to gratifie his *young She-Hearers*; *I ſhall direct my ſpeech unto you, and that to all, both Men and Women, but particularly to you that*

*that are young Women, whom especially I am now called to preach unto.* What the Call was, is not said, some extraordinary one, no doubt: But whether this Exhortation had been directed to Men or Women, to Young or Old, yet I wonder what Mr. *Vincent* thought of his Hearers, whether they were Turks, or Jews, or Pagans, for it is plain he did not look upon them as Christians, because he perswaded them to be married to Christ, to chuse Christ for their Husband: If they are the Members of the visible Church of Christ, they are already married to Christ, in the Scripture notion of it, and the proper Exhortation to them is, not to chuse Christ for their Husband, but to live worthy of that Relation: Neither Christ nor his Apostles ever made such an Exhortation as this; The proper Exhortation to those who are not Christians, is to embrace the Faith of Christ; and to those who are, to walk worthy of that Profession and Relation; but such Discourses, as these, perswade People, that to be married to Christ signifies something more than to be Christians, or else they would never with so much patience hear their Preachers exhorting them to be married to Christ, that is, to turn Christians; nor reproving them for slight-

ſlighting the offers of Chriſt, that is, for rejecting Chriſtianity.

And whether this notion, as it is managed by thoſe who beſt underſtand the conſequences of it, be not prejudicial to a good Life, I ſhall refer my Readers to my late Diſcourſe to conſider; for the whole of Religion at this rate conſiſts only in a fanciful application of Chriſt to themſelves, to conſummate the Marriage with him, and then whatever they were before, they are rich, and lovely, and beautiful, by vertue of their Marriage with a rich and lovely and beautiful Husband: When once they are married to Chriſt, they are ſecured from all the Arreſts of Gods Juſtice, as a Woman under Covert; the Bond is indiſſoluble, and Chriſt muſt now bear with all the faults of his Spouſe, and anſwer for all too: His Righteouſneſs muſt conceal their Deformities, and make them righteous before God; which I think doth not much encourage a perſonal and inherent Righteouſneſs.

Though to give Mr. *Vincent* his due, he does not underſtand the depths of this Myſtery, and therefore muſt not be charged with ſuch conſequences as he does not underſtand. He thinks honeſtly, that in order

order to our Marriage with Christ, *we must put off our filthy Garments, all filthiness and superfluity of naughtiness, &c. and that we must put on the white Raiment, and clean Garments, and rich Robes, which Christ hath provided for us, I mean the Attire of Grace, the Robes of his perfect Righteousness.*

I cannot but think, how severely Mr. *Shephard* would have corrected this mistake, and have told him, how unfit he was to be a Suiter for Christ. What? Must we make our selves beautiful before we are married to Christ, or receive all our beauty from him? Have you a mind to teach People such Antichristian Pride, as to go about to make themselves fit for Christ, before they will close with him? Which is a ready way to make them despise Christ, when they find themselves beautiful without him. And how is it possible, they should get the Robes of Christs Righteousness, till they are married to him? For it is only Marriage that gives us a title to the Righteousness and Fulness and All of Christ, as it gives a Woman right to her Husbands Estate.

And now if any man be agrieved at this, he must thank our Author for it, who has forc'd me in my own vindication to say more of Mr. *Vincent*, than ever I in-

tended; whoſe greateſt fault, for ought I ſee, is, that he affects to ſpeak in ſuch phraſes, as he does not underſtand; and might inſtruct people to good purpoſe, would he content himſelf with the plainneſs and unaffected ſimplicity of the Goſpel.

Having thus vindicated the Honeſty of my Intentions, the next objection is, That I have writ with great Scorn and Contempt; which is a very proper Objection to be made by ſo candid a man as Doctor *Owen*, whoſe Writings ſavour of ſuch a humble and mortified Spirit: Indeed had this Objection any truth in it, I could not have wiſhed for a better juſtification, than the Doctors Anſwer, which has ſo much out-done all that ever I ſaw in Satyr and Fury, that I muſt needs hereafter be eſteemed a very cold and tame Writer; I am ſure his Anſwer has pride and inſolence enough, and if it be not ſufficiently Scoptical, it is plain, that it was not for want of good will, but for want of wit.

But pray whom or what do I ſcorn? Do I make any ſpiteful Reflections upon mens Perſons? Do I tell merry Tales of them? Do I tranſproſe them, or dreſs them up in a fools Coat to be laught at? I ſhall leave theſe Arts to my Adverſaries, who are more

more vers'd, and better skill'd in them; the cauſe I undertook, did not need ſuch a Defence: My buſineſs indeed was to confute and to ſhame ſuch Doctrines as have a very bad influence upon mens lives, and yet are cried up for great Goſpel-Myſteries, and Soul-ſaving Truths; and this is that, the Doctor calls writing ſcornfully, that I have ſo plainly diſcovered the abſurdities of ſuch Doctrines, as to expoſe them to ſcorn and contempt; which as he obſerves very well, was my deſign in Writing, as well as I could to give them a ſhameful baffle: for I never thought my ſelf concerned to be tender of the reputation of dangerous, though popular, Errors. And that I do not attempt a grave and ſolemn confutation of Nonſenſe, or abſurd forms of ſpeech, is no fault, Mr. *Ferguſon* himſelf being Judge, who tells us, *That Non-ſenſe is not to be refuted, but expoſed. For he betrays the Weakneſs of his own Reaſon, who undertakes to encounter an abſurd phraſe with Arguments.* *The Intereſt of Reaſon in Religion,* P. 457.

And that the Reputation of Perſons is concerned in the Reputation of Doctrines, and that the ſcorn, which I beſtow on one, reflects upon the other, I cannot help, though they may: My only deſign was to confute their Doctrines, and there is not

any expreſſion which they call ſcornful, which was levell'd againſt the perſonal weakneſſes and infirmities of Men, but againſt the fulſome and palpable abſurdities of Opinions; and when ſuch abſurd notions are cried up for great and venerable Myſteries, there is the greater reaſon to ſpeak very plain, that they may appear abſurd to the meaneſt apprehenſion. This is the only Reaſon why my Book is accuſed of Scorn and Contempt; and I do not deny, but they have ſome reaſon to be angry at this, though I ſhall never be perſwaded to like my Book ever the worſe for it.

*Vind.* p. 143. But the Doctor obſerves farther, "That "the Diſcourſe, which I thus rave againſt, "is Didactical, and accommodated unto "a popular way of Inſtruction, and it hath "hitherto been the common ingenuity of "all learned men, to give an allowance "unto ſuch Diſcourſes, ſo as not to exact "from them an accuracy and propriety in "expreſſions, ſuch as are required in thoſe, "which are Scholaſtical and Polemical, *&c.* I cannot underſtand the reaſon of this Exception, when the Doctor, pag. 7. had ſo expreſly affirmed, *That he could not find any Thing, any Doctrine, any Expreſſions, any Words reflected on, which the Exceptions of this*

*this man do give him the leaſt occaſion to alter, or deſire that they had been otherwiſe either expreſſed or delivered.* Now if his Diſcourſe be writ with ſuch accuracy, what matter whether it be *Didactical* or *Polemical*: But as for the thing it ſelf, it muſt be acknowledged, that it is very diſingenuous to expect a Polemical Accuracy in Popular Diſcourſes, for it is not fit to inſtruct people in terms of Art, borrowed from the Schools of *Plato* or *Ariſtotle*, which, we may be ſure, the people underſtand not, nor it may be theſe Polemical men neither. But there is another kind of accuracy very neceſſary for Popular Diſcourſes, which I ſhould be very glad to find in Dr. *O.* and ſome late Writers, that is, ſtrict Truth, and plainneſs of expreſſion, and when Popular Diſcourſes are defective in theſe, it is no diſingenuity to take notice of it; for there is nothing does more miſchief to Religion, than to teach the people a Set of unintelligible and ambiguous Phraſes; which how-ever they may be forc'd to ſome tolerable ſenſe by men of Art and Skill, yet to the generality of Readers, either ſignifie nothing, or that which is very bad.

But by this the Doctor would fain inſinuate, that my Book conſiſts only of ſome

cavilling Exceptions about Words and Phraſes, and improper forms of Speech, which, if it could be proved, would be a more effectual confutation of it, than any I have yet ſeen; and yet the *Looking-Glaſs-Maker* proceeds upon this ſuppoſition, and therefore to requite me, picks quarrels with my Words, and diſcovers great improprieties, contradictions, nonſenſe; and writes juſt ſuch a Confutation of my Book as I ſhould have expected from a Court-Jeſter, or a *Prevaricator*. I ſhall give ſome few inſtances of this nature, which may be ſufficient to divert the Reader, and that is the only reaſon I know, why I ſhould take any notice of them: Except for fear the Author ſhould think himſelf ſlighted, and judge me of the ſame moroſe humour with Mr. *Hickman*, who uſes to puniſh ſuch Scriblers, *with not buying nor reading their Books*.

Preface to *Hiſtoria quinq; Arricularis exarticulata. Speculum*, p. 2.

Thus ſometimes I uſe ſome popular forms of Speech, the ſenſe of which is generally very well underſtood, but they will not down with our Author, becauſe they cannot be reconciled to ſtrict Rules of Logick, or terms of Art; thus he obſerves that I ſay in one place, *ſome men*, where-ever they meet with the word *Chriſt* in Scripture, alway underſtand by it the

the Perſon of Chriſt; and this I doubt not is true of a great many private Chriſtians, and ſome ignorant Preachers; but then in another place I affirm, that it is acknowledged by *all*, that Chriſt ſometimes ſignifies the *Church of Chriſt*; now this is a contradiction, that all ſometimes underſtand by the name Chriſt, the Church of Chriſt, and ſome always underſtand the perſon of Chriſt: But pray what need is there that *all* ſhould include thoſe *ſome*? Why could not he by *all*, underſtand all men of any knowledge and skill in the uſe of words, which *ſome*, and a great many, have not? How comes it to paſs, that he has ſo ſoon forgot their beloved diſtinction of *ſinguli generum, & genera ſingulorum*, whereby they prove, that Chriſt died for all, without dying for all?

Thus I obſerve, that Chriſt hath told us in the Goſpel, *whatever* he intends to do for us, and hath charged us to expect no more from him; which the circumſtances of the place determine to the terms and conditions of our Salvation by Chriſt; but nothing will ſerve our Author, unleſs *whatever* be ſuppoſed *to ſignifie all the particularities of Chriſts Providence towards the Church; as the very particular time when Kingly and Epiſcopal Government ſhould be reſtored* Ibid. p. 11

*here in England*: Though I doubt not, but our Author had much rather know, when they ſhall be pulled down again.

Thus when I ſay, *That now the only true Medium of knowing God, is the knowledge of Chriſt, who came into the World to declare God to us*: that is, as I ſoon add, *That the only certain way of attaining to the knowledge of the nature and will of God, is by knowing Chriſt, whom God ſent into the World to publiſh the everlaſting Goſpel, who hath made more perfect Revelations of Gods will, than ever the World had before, &c.* Becauſe I ſay, that Chriſt is the *only* true *Medium* of knowing God, he concludes, that I am a Fanatick, who reject the Light of Nature, and the Works of
Ibid. p. 14 Creation and Providence, as *falſe Mediums* of knowing God, *which muſt be thrown away, or not made uſe of*: But does he know what a true *Medium* is? It is that which gives us a clear and certain, and perfect knowledge; as a true *Medium* of ſight is that which conveys the perfect images of things with clearneſs and certainty: now will he ſay that the Light of Nature, *&c.* can give us ſuch a clear and perfect and certain knowledge of the nature of God, and his will concerning our Salvation, as the Revelations of the Goſpel? Or muſt they be falſe, or wholly rejected, becauſe they

they are not a *true Medium* of knowledge in that ſenſe, wherein the Goſpel of Chriſt is? But pray, who taught him to oppoſe the Light of Nature to the Goſpel of Chriſt? That he, who owns the Goſpel of Chriſt as the *only true Medium* of knowledge, muſt be ſuppoſed to reject the Light of Nature? I am ſure this is a *Fanatical* notion of the Goſpel of Chriſt; for Chriſt did not only reveal thoſe things to us, which could not be known by the Light of Nature, but gave us a more perfect and certain knowledge of thoſe things, which the Light of Nature did more imperfectly and uncertainly diſcover: And therefore the Goſpel of Chriſt is the ſureſt *Medium* of natural knowledge, *ſo far as it concerns matters of Religion*, as well as of revealed knowledge; I ſay, *as far as it concerns matters of Religion*, for fear this happy man at ſenſleſs miſtakes, ſhould imagine, that I mean that Chriſt taught *Natural Philoſophy* in the Goſpel.

At other times he quarrels with ſingle words and expreſſions, as very improper: As I ſay, *That Chriſt is originally the name of an Office, which the Jews call the Meſſias, or one anointed by God:* The plain meaning of which can be no more than this, that this Name Chriſt doth primarily reſpect an Office; that

that is, when this Name is given to any Person, it is wholly with respect to the Office with which he is invested; and though there can be no such thing, as an Office without a Person, yet the Name doth more immediately respect the Office than the Person; as is plain from this, that when we hear such a name, it does not convey the Idea of any particular person, but the notion of an Office to our minds; when we hear the Name King, Priest, or Prophet, it naturally excites in us the notion of those Offices, without regard to any particular persons invested with them; upon the hearing such names, our minds naturally prescind the consideration of the Office from the Person; and since words are but artificial images of things, we may safely affirm that to be the original signification of a name, which answers to that notion and idea, which it first imprints upon our minds. The reason our Author assigns, why Christ is not originally the name of an Office, is because it is a Con-
Spec. p. 3. crete, or Connotative term: but did he never hear of some Adjectives that are used Substantively, and so I take משיח and Χριστὸς to be, and when a word respects two things, may it not more immediately refer to one of them? And is not that then the

the original ſignification of the Name?

This I perceive is a very material Exception, and therefore is repeated by Mr. *Ferguſon*, together with a cenſure of another abſurd form of ſpeech, *The Duties and Actions of an Office*, at which Doctor *Owen* alſo had before quarrell'd: now the Duties and Actions of an Office is a very plain and ordinary form of ſpeech to ſignifie thoſe Duties and Actions, which are proper and peculiar to any perſon with reſpect to ſuch an Office; and no man who is in his wits, can by ſuch an expreſſion be led into ſuch a blundering miſtake, as to think that the Office is the *Agent*: Methinks Mr. *Ferguſon* might have learnt from the Title of his own Book to have been more favourable to ſuch forms of ſpeech, for *The Intereſt of Reaſon in Religion*, is to the full as abſurd, as the *Actions of an Office*; *Intereſt* is a term as proper and peculiar to a Perſon, as *Actions*, and pray what kind of Perſon is *Reaſon*? Juſt ſuch a Perſon as *In-dwelling-Sin*, or ſome mens *Conſciences*, which are often deſcribed, as if they were diſtinct Beings, which have Properties, Actions, Powers, and a kind of Perſonality and Subſiſtence of their own, diſtinct from the man, in whom they are. And indeed I have no reaſon to quarrel with theſe men, who P. 457.

deal

deal much more favourably with me, than they do with St. *Paul* in the like caſes: they only reprove me for an improper expreſſion, but do not affix an improper ſenſe to my words; whereas they uſually make St. *Paul*'s meaning to be as abſurd, as they fancy my words improper.

But to return to our Author: I add farther, that this name Chriſt is uſed to ſignifie the Perſon who is inveſted with that Office: Which our Author ſays, *Is a rare and odd notion; for as the name Chriſt never ſignifies the Office abſtracted from the Perſon, ſo it never ſignifies the Perſon, but as inveſted with the Office*: But what then? *Chriſt* may be uſed as a *proper* name, to ſignifie ſuch a *determinate* Perſon, which very much differs from the more general acceptation of the word without affixing it to any particular perſon, as every School-boy knows. A Poet, or Orator, or Philoſopher, are names which may be indifferently given to any Poet, Orator, or Philoſopher, and therefore do not in their own nature ſignifie any determinate Perſon; but if theſe names be given by eminency, or for any other reaſon, to any particular Perſons, as to *Ariſtotle*, or *Tully*, or *Virgil*, this doth as much alter the property of them, as when the name of the Species is appropri-

Ibid. p. 7.

ated

ated to any one Individual: Thus it is here, Chriſt may ſignifie any one, who is anointed by God to any Office, or it may reſpect the particular Office of the Meſſias, without knowing who ſhall bear this Office; but beſides this, it may denote ſome determinate Perſon, as *Jeſus* of *Nazareth*, who is inveſted in this Office. And he who knows not how to diſtinguiſh a common Name, from the ſame Name, when it is appropriated to a particular Perſon, has not much reaſon to talk either of Grammar or Logick.

But this, it ſeems, is too hard for our Authors underſtanding; who can by no means conceive the difference between acknowledging Jeſus to be the Chriſt, as his Diſciples and ſome other Jews ſometimes did in his life-time, and uſing Chriſt as a proper Name, to ſignifie the ſame Perſon who was called *Jeſus*. As if to ſay *Ariſtotle* is a Philoſopher, and to ſay that Philoſopher is the proper name of *Ariſtotle*, were the ſame thing. Ibid. p. 8.

He adds, *The reaſon, why the Evangeliſts uſe the name Jeſus more frequently than the name Chriſt, could not be, becauſe in the life-time of Chriſt it was diſputed whether Jeſus were the Chriſt, for the Goſpels were all written after the Reſurrection of Chriſt, and one of them was written*

*written after all Paul's Epiſtles were written, at which time there were many Churches founded on this perſwaſion and belief, that Jeſus was the Chriſt.*

But our Author miſtakes the ſtate of the queſtion, which is not why the name Chriſt is uſed more *frequently* in the Epiſtles than in the Goſpels, but why it is not uſed at all in the Goſpels, as a *proper name*: and his reaſon ſhews, that he would make no very good Hiſtorian, but would relate things not according to the Cuſtoms and Uſages of the Times, wherein they were acted, but according to the practice of the Times, wherein he writ; for otherwiſe it is nothing to the purpoſe, at what time the Goſpels were writ, nor what was the belief and practice of that Age, if we ſuppoſe the Goſpels to be a true Hiſtory, not of thoſe preſent times, but of the Life of Chriſt, and of that Age wherein he lived.

*Speculum, P. 42.* He argues much at the ſame rate in another place, where he would prove, that the Sermons & Parables of our Saviour ought not to be of greater Authority in the Chriſtian Church, than the Writings of the Apoſtles (which is contrary to the Judgment and practice of the Ancient Church) and his Argument is extraordinary ſubtil; *Be-*

*cauſe*

*cauſe our Saviour did no more write the four Goſpels, than he did the Epiſtles; the ſame Spirit that inſpired Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, to write the Goſpels, inſpired Paul, Peter, James, John, Jude, to write the Epiſtles.* As if the Authority of our Saviours Sermons did depend upon the Writer, not on the Speaker: There is a vaſt difference between the Truth of a Relation, and the Authority of thoſe Sermons and Parables contained in it; the firſt depends upon the honeſty of the Hiſtorian, the ſecond upon the Authority of the Speaker: So that though *Matthew*, or *Mark*, &c. wrote the Hiſtory of the Goſpel, yet the Sermons and Parables of the Goſpel derive their authority and veneration from Chriſt himſelf: and therefore the compariſon between the Goſpels and Epiſtles does not lie between St. *Mathew* and *Mark*, &c. and St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*, but between Chriſt and his Apoſtles: and though the Evangeliſts were inſpired men, yet the only inſpiration, which was neceſſary for this Work, was only to help their Memories to make a true and faithful Relation of what our Saviour did and taught; and though the Apoſtles were inſpired men too, yet their very Inſpirations were to be examined by the Doctrine of the Goſpel, which was

to

to be the Rule of their Preaching and Writings.

But to return: In pag. 4. I find our Author in a great amazement, and I always ſuſpected ſomething was the matter with him, that he wrote ſo much like a man out of his wits; the occaſion of it is, that I ſay, *That all theſe Offices of Prophet, Prieſt, and King, are not properly diſtinct Offices in Chriſt, but the ſeveral parts and adminiſtrations of his Mediatory Kingdom.* Here he firſt obſerves, *That 'tis a ſtrange Preſumption for a Young Divine, to ſay that theſe Offices are not diſtinct Offices in Chriſt, and never in the leaſt ſuggeſt, wherein the impropriety of ſo calling them doth lie*: But I did not ſay that they are not diſtinct Offices, but not ſo *properly* diſtinct Offices; and had he not been in a great amazement, he might have ſeen the reaſons, why I ſaid ſo, becauſe Chriſt did exerciſe a Regal Power and Authority in each of theſe Offices: and the reaſon why I choſe to ſtate it in this manner, was the better to ſhow, how all theſe Offices did conſpire to the ſame end: *Chriſt* is a Mediatory King, whoſe Office is to reconcile God and Man, and in order to attain this end, he gives us his Laws to be the Rule of our Lives, makes Atonement for our Sins, and powerfully beſtows

all

all those Blessings on us, which he hath purchased by his death: All this is necessary to the Recovery of lost man, and therefore we must not expect to receive any benefit by his Expiation and Sacrifice, without Obedience to his Laws, nor think that his Kingly Power will save those, who submit not to his Rule and Government; which those are very apt to do, who do not consider how all these Offices belong to him as a Mediatory King, but look upon them as such distinct things, which have distinct effects, without any relation to, or dependance on each other.

For this very reason a late Reverend Author quarrels at Mr. *Baxter*'s definition of Justifying Faith, that it is to receive *Christ* in all his *Offices*, as Prophet, Priest, and King. He dares not deny that justifying Faith must receive a whole *Christ*, but then he affirms, that Christ is the formal Object of justifying Faith, not considered as Prophet or King, but as Priest. *Etsi Idem Christus sit Dominus & Sacerdos, totusque in justificatione recipiatur, totus tamen omni sensu,* i. e. *omnium promiscue munerum intuitu ad justificationem formaliter minime requiritur, sed tantum qua Sacerdos, & legi satisfaciens*: i. e. *Though the same Christ be both Lord and Priest, and whole Christ is received in justification, yet not under* *Justificatio Paulina*, p. 112.

*that formal consideration, as a whole Christ, in all his Offices, but only as a Priest, who makes satisfaction to the Law.* And the reason which he assigns for it, is this, That Justification consists in being delivered from the Curse of the Law; that the only way whereby we are delivered from this Curse, is the Satisfaction of Christ; and Christ made this Satisfaction for us, only as our Priest and Sacrifice: And this were a good reason indeed for justifying Faith to eye Christ only as our Priest and Sacrifice, if his Satisfaction alone could give us a title to Justification; if expiation of sin were the only thing required to the pardon of it: The Sacrifice of Christ hath made a general expiation for the sins of the world, but this Satisfaction it self intitles no particular man to the benefit of it; that more properly belongs to the Prophetical and Kingly Office, to confer a Right and Title to the Benefits of Christs Priesthood; and therefore we must first receive Christ, as our Prophet, and our King, that is, must believe his Revelations, obey his Laws, and submit to his Government, before we have any reason to look on him as our Priest, to expiate our sins. His Priestly and Prophetical Offices are but subservient to his Regal Power, (as the Priests and Prophets

phets under the Law, were to their Kings) and therefore can have no effect without our ſubjection to Chriſt, as our Lord and King, which unites us to him, and makes us Members of his Body, which he redeemed and purchaſed with his Blood.

But then he wonders, why *they may not be diſtinct Offices, and yet parts of Chriſts Mediatory Kingdom*: but then I wonder too, what he means by *diſtinct Offices*, and *parts*: When I ſay they are not properly to be conſidered as diſtinct Offices, by diſtinct Offices I mean, ſuch Offices, as have no dependance upon each other, but can attain their ends ſingle and apart; and when I ſay, they are ſeveral parts of the Mediatory Kingdom, I mean, as any one might eaſily gueſs, that though there are ſeveral Acts diſtinct from each other, and proper to each of theſe Offices, yet they all center in one common end; they are all but the different adminiſtrations of the Mediatory Kingdom, and neceſſary to produce the ſame effect, the Salvation of Mankind. But this troubles him too, that I ſay, they are the different adminiſtrations of this Mediatory Kingdom; for ſays our Author, *Is an Office an Adminiſtration?* No, by no means, therefore I ſay they ought not to be look'd on as different Offices, but as *Spec.* ibid.

different Administrations of the same Supreme Office, which comprehends them all.

But then he would fain know, *what kind of Totum a Mediatory Kingdom is, to the Offices of Prophet, Priest, and King*: Why Sir, just such a *Totum* as consists of three parts: His mistake, which occasions this wondering humour, is, that he thought a Mediatory Kingdom and the Office of a King, to be of equal extent, and therefore that the Office of a King could not be contained under a Mediatory Kingdom, as a part is contained in the whole; Whereas every Puny in Divinity knows, that a *Mediatory Kingdom* is of a larger extent than the meer Office of a King, and contains the Prophetical and Priestly Offices under it: Which is like another of his mistakes, that because (as he observes from Doctor *Jackson* and Doctor *Hammond*) Christ was consecrated to his Priestly Office by his Sufferings and Death, therefore he was not consecrated to his Mediatory Office (as I assert) by being anointed with the Holy Ghost and with Power; as if Christ might not have a general Consecration to his Mediatory Office, and a particular Consecration to the particular parts of it: though Doctor *Hammond* only says, That the Death of Christ was his Consecration

to

to his *Melchiſedechian* Prieſthood, but was it ſelf an act of his *Aaronical* Prieſthood.

But I ſee the moſt innocent expreſſions ſhall not eſcape the ſevereſt Cenſures, when we have to deal with men, who can underſtand nothing, which is out of their common road of phraſes: Mr. *Ferguſon* draws up a very ſevere Charge againſt me upon this ſcore, as if I confounded the Offices of Chriſt, and denied his Prieſthood, and his Expiation and Sacrifice: and yet would have the World believe, that if he had not been in a very good humour, he could have handled me after another rate: Truly what his humour is I cannot tell, but I am ſure that either his Underſtanding, or his Conſcience, is not very good. He takes a great deal of laudable pains to prove, *that the Offices of Prophet, Prieſt, and King, though they be not ſeparated in their Subject, the Perſon of Chriſt, yet they are in their Natures, Objects, Acts, and Effects diſtinguiſhed one from the other*: But do I any where deny this? Becauſe I ſay, *that they are ſeveral Parts, and different Adminiſtrations of his Mediatory Kingdom*, does it hence follow, that they are not ſeveral Parts and different Adminiſtrations? That they do not differ in their Natures, Acts, and Effects? As for inſtance, the Paternal Go-

*The Intereſt of Reaſon in Religion*, p. 388.

vernment consists of very different parts, as the Education of Children, providing Food and Raiment for them, correcting them when they do amiss, and incouraging their Vertues, placing them with prudent Masters and Governours, and providing for their future subsistence, and the like: Now will any man say, that there is no difference between feeding Children, and correcting them, and sending them to School, and putting them out to serve an apprentiship to a Trade, whereby they may get their Livings, because all these do equally belong to a Fathers care, and are contained under the general notion of Paternal Government? Thus when we say, that Christ is a Saviour, or which is the same thing, a Mediatory King, and that the Offices of Prophet, Priest, and King, are but the several Parts, and different Administrations of his Mediatory Kingdom, that is, they are all essential to the Office of a Saviour, and included in the notion of it, and necessary to the same end, the Salvation of Mankind; can any man hence reasonably infer, that they do not differ in their particular Natures, Acts, Objects, and Effects?

P. 392.

But Mr. *Ferguson* proves, that I make no difference between Christs Priestly and Kingly

Kingly Office, becauſe I ſay, *that Chriſts offering himſelf a Sacrifice for Sin, was an Act of Kingſhip.* But I ſay no ſuch thing: My words are theſe; *When he offered himſelf a Sacrifice for Sin, he acted like a King.* Now can our Author perceive no difference between theſe two expreſſions, that *Chriſts offering himſelf a Sacrifice for Sin, was an Act of Kingſhip*; and, *When he offered himſelf a Sacrifice for Sin, he acted like a King?* The firſt ſignifies, that the nature of his Sacrifice and Oblation conſiſts in the exerciſe of a Regal Power, which indeed confounds his Prieſtly and Kingly Offices; the other only ſignifies, that at the very ſame time, and in that very Act, when he offered himſelf a Sacrifice for Sin, he exerciſed the Power of a King too; that is, as I explained it, that his Life was not taken from him by external force and power, but his laying down his Life was an Act of Authority; *He had power to lay it down, and he had power to take it again:* And I wonder Mr. *Ferguſon* ſhould think it any derogation from our Saviours Power and Authority, that he adds, *This Command have I received from my Father*; for I would fain know of him, what Authority and Power that is, which Chriſt, as Mediator, has not received from his Father, and does not ex-

ercise by his Command, and in subordination to him: A Mediatory Kingdom is a received and subordinate Power; it is Obedience with respect to God, and Authority and Power with respect to Men. And had this Author been so honest, as to have considered, what I immediately subjoyn, he could not have suspected me of *Socinianizing*, or of confounding the Priestly and Kingly Office, *viz. Herein Christ differs from other Kings, that he laid the Foundation of his Kingdom in his own Blood, that he purchas'd and redeem'd his Subjects with the Sacrifice of himself.*

P. 395. Such another mistake one may observe in our Author, when he makes me to say, *That the Sacerdotal Office is only a part and different Administration of the Regal*: Whereas I never thought, that the Sacerdotal Office was part of the Regal Office, but that the Priestly and Kingly and Prophetical Offices were several Parts and different Administrations of the Mediatory Kingdom: And when I affirm, that they were *several* parts of the Mediatory Kingdom, I had not so little wit in the same breath to affirm, that they were parts of each other, which is a down-right contradiction: but I see, our Author, with all his Learning, cannot distinguish between a

Kingly

Kingly Office, and a Mediatory Kingdom.

In the like manner he arraigns me for a *Socinian*, for aſſerting that *Interceſſion ſignifies the Adminiſtration of Chriſts Mediatory Kingdom, the Power of a Regal Prieſt to expiate and forgive ſins*: Though either our Author is very ignorant, or cannot but know, that what I there aſſert, has no affinity with the *Socinian* Notion; for I expreſly attribute the Virtue and Efficacy of his Interceſſion, *to the Expiation and Sacrifice of his Death*, and cite *Heb.* ix. 12. to that purpoſe, which I am ſure no *Socinian* can own. P. 393.

The proper notion of an Advocate or Interceſſor is one, who offers up our Prayers and Petitions, and procures an Anſwer, which was repreſented by the High Prieſts offering Incenſe in the Holy of Holies, which ſignified the Prayers of the Congregation; and therefore we find that while the Prieſt offered Incenſe in the Holy Place, the People uſed to pray without, that their Prayers might aſcend together with the Incenſe, *Luke* i. 10. So that Chriſts Interceſſion is founded on the virtue of his Sacrifice, but it is not the *repreſentation of his Meritorius Sacrifice*, as Mr. *Ferguſon* imagines, but the Recommendation of our Prayers and Perſons to God by virtue of his meritorious Sacrifice: and there-

therefore the Interceſſion of Chriſt is deſcribed by his being *able to ſave all thoſe to the uttermoſt, who come unto God by him*, Heb. vii. 25. And ſince we have ſuch an High Prieſt, who intercedes for us, and is ſenſible of our Infirmities, we are exhorted to *come boldly to the Throne of Grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find Grace to help in time of need*, Heb. iv. 16.

The death of Chriſt upon the Croſs was a Sacrifice for Sin, was an Act of his *Aaronical* Prieſthood, to make Atonement for Sin by the Sacrifice of himſelf; but when he aſcended into Heaven, and had preſented his Blood in the holy Place, he was no longer then a Prieſt after the Order of *Aaron*, but after the Order of *Melchiſedeck*, as the Apoſtle proves at large in the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*; his work is not to offer himſelf any more in Sacrifice, *for he hath by one offering for ever perfected them who are ſanctified*; but his Office is to bleſs the People in Gods Name, as *Melchiſedeck* bleſſed *Abraham*: *God hath ſent his Son to bleſs us, in turning of us from our iniquities*: *He hath exalted him to be a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance unto Iſrael, and remiſſion of ſins.*

So that now in virtue of his Death and Sacrifice, Chriſt doth not intercede, like ſome

ſome meaner Advocates, by Prayers and Intreaties, *having all power both in Heaven and Earth committed to him*, but doth by his Power and Authority, which he received from God, as the Purchaſe and Reward of his Death and Sufferings, beſtow all thoſe Bleſſings on us which we want, and pray for in his Name.

For this Reaſon, I aſſerted, *That Chriſts Interceſſion is the Power of a Regal Prieſt, to expiate and forgive ſins*; not to make atonement for them, which he did by his Death and Sacrifice, (as Mr. *Ferguſon* would pervert my words) but to apply this Expiation and Atonement to us, in the actual forgiveneſs of our ſins.

And this is ſo plain and evident a Truth, that Mr. *Ferguſon* himſelf cannot deny it, though he quarrels with me for aſſerting it, being willing, it ſeems, to find fault, if he knew how: His Words are theſe: *Indeed his Interceſſion, as upon the one hand it is founded on his Oblation and Sacrifice, being nothing but the repreſentation of his meritorious Paſſion, and a continuation of his ſacerdotal Function* (which, as I obſerved before, is a miſtaken notion of Chriſts Interceſſion, as confounding his Sacrifice with his Interceſſion, which is indeed founded on his Sacrifice, and receives all its virtue and efficacy P. 391.

efficacy from it, but yet is of a diſtinct nature and conſideration) *ſo on the other hand, it hath its effects towards us by virtue of the interpoſition of ſome Acts of his Kingly Office: For theſe Offices being all veſted in the ſame Perſon, and having all the ſame general End, and belonging all to the Work of Mediation, it cannot otherwiſe be, but that their Acts muſt have a mutual reſpect to each other; but yet the Prieſtly Office, to which Interceſſion appertains, is formally diſtinct from his Kingly.* In which words he acknowledges, that Chriſts Interceſſion, as it reſpects us, and conſiſts in beſtowing thoſe Bleſſings on us, which we want, and which he hath purchaſed, is an Act of Kingly Power and Authority; which is as much, as I aſſerted, or ever intended to aſſert: And as for what he adds, that *ſtill his Prieſtly Office is formally diſtinguiſh'd from his Kingly*, I readily grant it, ſo far as it reſpects his Sacrifice and Expiation, which is an Act of his *Aaronical* Prieſthood; but as it reſpects his Interceſſion, which is an Act of his *Melchiſedechian* Prieſthood, his Kingly and Prieſtly Offices are ſo cloſely united, that he is rather to be conſidered as a Regal Prieſt, than as either Prieſt or King, becauſe it is the exerciſe of that Power and Authority which is founded on his Sacrifice.

And

And by this time, I hope, every ordinary Reader will ſee what a vain and malicious attempt it was, for this Author to endeavour to repreſent me as a *Socinian*; of which Candor and Ingenuity, I ſhall give ſeveral other Inſtances hereafter; and that he might have ſpared his pains in proving, that the Kingly and Prieſtly Offices in Chriſt are diſtinct, and that Chriſt is not a Metaphorical, but a proper Prieſt.

But to return to our *Looking-Glaſs-Maker*, he quarrels ſtill, that I ſay, *That Chriſts preaching the Goſpel was the exerciſe of his Regal Power in publiſhing his Laws:* Our Author can underſtand, *that to enact Laws is an exerciſe of a Regal Power, but not to publiſh them, which would make every inferior Herald a King*: This is a very wiſe Objection, which ſhews his Skill in Laws and Government: It is not indeed neceſſary for a King to publiſh his Laws in his own Perſon; this was a peculiar condeſcenſion of our Saviour, to come in Perſon to us to publiſh his Laws; but yet the publication of Laws muſt be made by the ſame Authority, which Enacts them; for publication is of the very eſſence of a Law, and by wiſer men than our Author, put into the definition of it, and therefore is the proper exerciſe of Regal Power.

I doubt my Readers will be quite tired with my taking notice of ſuch impertinent Cavils, and therefore I ſhall add but one or two more, which are very remarkable, and diſmiſs our Author for the preſent: *I commend the Wiſdom and Honeſty of our Church, for teaching her Children a Religion without Art or Subtility*: Our Author diſproves this, by ſhewing that no Child can underſtand the Church-Catechiſm without great art and ſubtilty: he cannot underſtand what it is to be a *Member of Chriſt*, without underſtanding the various ſignifications of the Name Chriſt, and whether he muſt be made a Member of the Church, or of the Perſon of Chriſt; and then he muſt know what this Church is, which requires great ſubtilty, *&c.* Now by the ſame argument I can prove, that a Child cannot underſtand the eaſieſt thing in Nature, without unridling all the Myſteries of Philoſophy; as for inſtance, at this rate a Child cannot underſtand what Bread is, unleſs he firſt underſtand what Matter is, and then he muſt underſtand all the difficulties of Quantity, and whether it conſiſt of Diviſibles or Indiviſibles, and muſt underſtand the differences of Matter, and the reaſon, why he can bite one ſort of Matter with his Teeth, but can make

*Speculum*, p. 31.

make no impreſſion upon another: and how the parts of matter hang together, and the like. There is a more general indiſtinct apprehenſion of things, which is ſufficient to govern our Actions, though we do not underſtand all the Niceties and Philoſophy of them. But if our Author can find ſuch ſubtilties in thoſe plain matters, which are taught Children in the Church-Catechiſm, (which are objections that will indifferently lie againſt the plaineſt Inſtructions) what does he think of thoſe ſublime matters of the Eternal Decrees and Counſels of God, Election and Reprobation, and ſuch-like Myſteries, which are ſo familiarly thruſt into Catechiſms? What ſubtilty is required in Children to underſtand theſe deep Points, and to comprehend the ſubtil and artificial Schemes of Orthodoxy?

This is much like another Cavil againſt the intelligibleneſs of our Union with Chriſt: *I am ſure* (ſays our Author) *that our Union with Chriſt is an Union*: No doubt Sir; *and if it be ſo, it cannot be very eaſie to be underſtood, becauſe the Metaphyſical notion of Union is as difficult as any other tranſcendental term*: Why then let the Metaphyſicians diſpute it out; but for all that, I can eaſily underſtand, and I believe any P. 36.

one

one elſe can, what it is to be related to Chriſt, as Subjects are to their Prince, and Diſciples to their Maſter, and Wives to their Husbands, *&c.*

This is enough to give the Reader a taſte of our Authors Skill; and ſhould I add any more, it might bring my own diſcretion into queſtion: for next to making fooliſh and cavilling Objections, it is an argument of a very little Wit to anſwer them.

*Vind.* P. 1. And therefore to proceed, Dr. *Owen* obſerves, that I have writ againſt his Book, *which was writ and publiſhed near twenty years ſince*: I confeſs I do not well underſtand the force of this Objection, unleſs he imagine that his Book is now grown venerable for its antiquity; but where-ever the force of it lies, I am ſure it anſwers another grand Objection againſt me (which is ſo often repeated) that *I am a Young Man*, a defect which time will mend, and which Induſtry will ſupply: However I ſuppoſe the Doctor was not very old twenty years ago, and it argu'd ſome Modeſty in the *young Man*, rather to attack a Book writ by the Doctor, when he was a young Man too, than rudely to aſſault his Writings of a later date, which may be preſumed to be the effects of a more mature Judgment

ment, and riper years; and I hope this conſideration will plead my excuſe with him, for not undertaking that task, which he has ſo kindly allotted me, right or wrong, to anſwer all his late voluminous Treatiſes, which I think I may as ſoon be perſwaded to do, as to read them; that magnificent Title of *Exercitations*, which uſed to be prefixed before ſome learned Diſcourſes, invited me to take a little taſte of them, till I found my ſelf miſtaken, and deceived with ſome jejune or trite Obſervations; which has ſo put me out of conceit with flattering Titles, that I ſhall never again believe the Titles of Books or Chapters, for his ſake.

*But this Book has had the approbation of as Learned and Holy Perſons, it may be, as any the Doctor knows living in England, or out of it, who owning the Truth contained in it, have highly avowed its Uſefulneſs, and are ready yet ſo to do.* I fear that either the Doctor's Acquaintance with Learned and Holy Men, is not very great, or that this is not true; for I cannot conceive, how very holy men ſhould ſo approve a Book which is ſo little a Friend to Holineſs, or that learned men ſhould be pleaſed with ſuch looſe and inconſequent Reaſonings; but let that be as it will, I am ſure there are as learned

and as holy men, who do as little approve it; unleſs the Doctor thinks, that Learning and Holineſs are confined to his own Party, or that the approbation of his Writings is the only ſure teſt of Mens Learning and Holineſs.

But the great charge of all, which runs thorow his whole Book, is, that I have miſ-repreſented his words, and perverted his ſenſe, which ſometimes he attributes to ignorance, ſometimes to malice, ſometimes he calls it an *impudent falſhood*, ſometimes *flagitiouſly falſe*, and ſhows very great Skill at varying phraſes, which he is much better at, than at writing Controverſies.

Whether this Charge be true or not, ſhall be examined particularly, as far as I can reduce the ſeveral particulars of this Charge into any order: But to abate the wonder a little, I muſt inform my Reader, that this is Dr. *Owen*'s way of anſwering Books, to deny thoſe Doctrines which he dares not own, or cannot vindicate; I am not the firſt who have been charged with ſuch falſifications; Mr. *Baxter* was taxed with it long ſince, in a whole Book written for that very purpoſe, intitled, *Of the Death of Chriſt, and of Juſtification, the Doctrine concerning them formerly deliverd, vindicated from*

*from the Animadverſions of Mr. R. B.* where this grave man is corrected as magiſterially, as if he had been ſuch another Stripling as my ſelf. Towards the concluſion of that Diſcourſe, I meet with a very excellent Prayer: *If I muſt engage again in the like kind, I ſhall pray, That He, from whom are all my ſupplies, would give me a real humble frame of heart, that I may have no need with many pretences, and a multitude of good words, to make a cloak for a Spirit breaking frequently thorow all with ſad diſcoveries of Pride and Paſſion, and to keep me from all magiſterial inſolence, phariſaical ſupercilious ſelf-conceitedneſs, contempt of others, and every thing that is contrary to the Rule, whereby I ought to walk.* It is great pity that Forms of Prayer are not lawful, for this is too good a Prayer to be uſed but once in a mans life; which I doubt, is one reaſon, why we ſee no better effects of it in the Doctors Writings.

But there is a heavier Charge than all this behind, which is frequently hinted by Doctor *Owen*, and more expreſly managed by Mr. *Ferguſon*, who in his Preface tells his Readers, *That I treat the ſacred Writers with as much contempt as I do* T. W. *and Burleſque the Scripture no leſs than others have done Virgil's Poems.* This would be a terrible Adverſary, were he as good at his

proofs, as he is bold and daring in his Charge. This is a crime of a very high nature to *burleſque Scripture*, and the foulneſs of the imputation might juſtly have provoked a tamer man than my ſelf, did not his weak and ridiculous proofs more deſerve contempt, than any ſerious reſentment.

He waves the proof of this in his Preface; but in his ſecond Chapter, where he entertains his Readers with a tedious impertinent Diſcourſe about Metaphors and Allegories, and very gravely ſtates the difference between a Metaphor and Allegory, and Parable, *&c.* as if he were reading a Rhetorick Lecture to his Schoolboys; and very ſtrongly proves, that it is lawful to uſe Metaphors, and that the Spirit of God in Scripture does ſo, (it being his peculiar Talent to prove that which no body denies) at length he comes
P. 376. to the buſineſs, to ſhow *that ſome of the expreſſions reflected on in the Writings of the Nonconformiſts, are ſuch as the Holy Ghoſt himſelf hath preceded them in the uſe of, and that to the very ſame ends and purpoſes for which they produce them. And that he may not be thought to deſign the diſparagement of any party of men, by quoting Teſtimonies from divers of their Authors, who rather than not ſtrain up the dregs of*

*of their choler againſt the Fanaticks, for their Phraſeologies, have even written in derogation of Scripture-phraſes; and made the Spirit of God the ſubject of their deriſion, as well as the Nonconformiſts; to avoid this, he confines himſelf to me alone.* This is true Fanatick Charity: He will by no means, good man! diſparage any party of men, only he informs his *Readers* that there are a ſort of men, who write againſt the Fanaticks (and it is pretty well known who they are) *that make the Spirit of God the ſubject of their deriſion*: And why ſo I pray? becauſe they laugh at the *Fanaticks* for their ridiculous abuſe of Scripture-Phraſes and Metaphors: Though they prate Nonſenſe in Scripture-phraſe, yet becauſe it is the phraſe of Scripture which they thus abuſe, every one, who laughs at them for it, if we will believe Mr. *Ferguſon*, *makes the Spirit of God the ſubject of his deriſion.*

And yet our Author, when he is in a better mood, tells us, *But let them and all ſuch Perſons, of what communion and perſwaſion ſoever they are, who turn the Goſpel thus into a Romance, and ſubvert the Myſteries of Faith, by transforming them into Phantaſtick Allegories, be treated with the deriſion and contempt of all, who pretend to Wiſdom and Modeſty.* So that it ſeems, ſome men may turn

*The Intereſt of Reaſon in Religion,* p. 311.

the very Goſpel it ſelf into a Romance, and abuſe the Phraſes and Expreſſions of Scripture to very evil purpoſes; and then it is not a *deriding the Spirit of God*, but that which is conſiſtent with *Wiſdom* and *Modeſty*, to expoſe them to deriſion and contempt. Thus contrary is our Author to himſelf, when he oppoſes the Quakers, and vindicates his own dear Brethren, who have abuſed Scripture-expreſſions as groſly, though in many caſes with leſs wit, and to worſe purpoſes, than the Quakers themſelves; as he is forc'd to acknowledge of *T. W.* that *maybe*, in ſome things he * *hath prevaricated*, which is in plain Engliſh to ſay, that it may be, he hath either play'd the Fool or the Knave, for which character *T. W.* is very much beholden to Mr. *Ferguſon*.

* Ibid. P. 384.

But he hath taken care, that no other Perſon ſhall be able to anſwer this Charge; for though he very charitably accuſes all men, who write againſt the Fanaticks, yet he names no man, nor gives any particular inſtances of this prophane deriſion of the Holy Spirit; only *I* am ſingled out to bear the fury of his aſſault; and I am very well contented with it, provided that if I acquit my ſelf, his bare Teſtimony may not be taken againſt any man, till

the

the Cauſe be firſt heard and tried.

The plain ſtate of the Controverſie is this: I charge them with drawing a New Scheme of Religion, ſuch as is no where to be found in expreſs terms in Scripture, from a pretended Acquaintance with Chriſts Perſon; I foreſaw an eaſie and obvious objection againſt this, that there are no men, who ſtuff their Books and Diſcourſes with more frequent quotations of Scripture, than they do; right or wrong they have a Scripture-proof for every thing they ſay; and does it not look like a calumny then to charge them with fetching their Religion from any other Fountain than the holy Scriptures? In anſwer to this, I made it appear, that they expound Scriptures according to their own fancies, and in compliance with their pre-conceived opinions; that they do not fetch their notions from the Scriptures, but wreſt the Scriptures from their proper and genuine ſenſe, to make them countenance their own fancies. Now becauſe I produce thoſe Scripture expreſſions which theſe men pervert and burleſque (to uſe his own word) by their wild and fanciful applications, Mr. *Ferguſon* had no way to be even with me, but to charge me with burleſquing the Scripture it ſelf.

Knowledg of Chriſt, Chap. 3. Sect. 4. P. 102.

As for inſtance: They tell us, That all we have to do in order to our ſalvation, is *to get into Chriſt*, and *to be united to him*, for then his Fulneſs, and Beauty, and Riches, and Righteouſneſs, and Merits, and All, is ours; and in order to this Union (which what it is, they could never yet explain) we muſt firſt *come to Chriſt, and then receive him, and apply his Merits and Righteouſneſs to our ſelves, and then lean, and reſt, and roll our Souls upon him, and truſt to be ſaved wholly by his Merits, without any Righteouſneſs of our own:* and all this they learnedly prove from thoſe Scripture-expreſſions of *coming to Chriſt, and receiving him*, &c. which ſignifie no more than believing in Chriſt, or undertaking the publick Profeſſion of Chriſtianity; but becauſe I ſhow how far theſe Scripture-phraſes are from countenancing their Gibberiſh, Mr. *Ferguſon* challenges me with *burleſquing* the Scripture. *Coming to Chriſt*, ſignifies, according to the Eaſtern Dialect, to believe in Chriſt, or to become his Diſciple; but becauſe it is called *coming*, hence theſe men of fancy dream of I know not what ſpiritual progreſs of the Soul to Chriſt; and explain believing, by *coming to Chriſt*, which in their Divinity is one of the firſt Acts of Faith.

Now becauſe I ſay, That it falls out

*luckily*

*luckily*, that Faith is called *coming*, I am charged with deriding the Scripture; whereas it is plain, that if I deride any thing, it is only their fooliſh Explications of Scripture-phraſes: for all their Myſtical Divinity had been ſpoiled, and they muſt have been forc'd to have ſpoke plain ſenſe, like other men, or to have ſpoke Nonſenſe without the leaſt pretence of the authority of Scripture, had it not been for ſuch *Eaſtern* Phraſes, which were intended by the Holy Ghoſt to another purpoſe, but are capable of being perverted by *ſuch Engliſh* Divines, to the countenancing of a *New-faſhion'd Engliſh Divinity*; and I think ſtill, that this fell out very *luckily* for them. Thus with an equal skill and ingenuity, he accounts it deriding the Scripture, to ſay, *That coming and going are very intelligible explications of believing*; whereas *coming* muſt be explained by *believing*, not believing by *coming*, unleſs we will in a proper ſenſe burleſque the Scripture.

Thus becauſe I reject their fanciful and preſumptuous truſt and confidence in Chriſt, *viz. to be ſaved by him for no other reaſon, but becauſe they truſt to be ſaved by him*; I am charged with deriding all truſt and dependence on Chriſt, for the performance

mance of his Promiſes, or the influences of his Grace; and becauſe I reject their proof of this from St. *Paul*'s truſting in God in the faithful diſcharge of his Apoſtolical Office, notwithſtanding all the Perſecutions he ſuffered from Jews and Heathens, 2 *Tim.* 1. 12. I am accuſed of *involving the Scripture in the ſame condemnation, and bringing St. Paul himſelf under the ſame imputation*: Certainly theſe men think themſelves all Apoſtles, and that they expound the Scriptures with as infallible a Spirit as firſt indited them; for otherwiſe they would not be ſo impudent, as to charge every man, who laughs at their ridiculous applications of Scripture-phraſes, with deriding the Scriptures, and the holy Spirit.

Ib. p. 381.

And yet this is the true Reaſon of all this noiſe and out-cry about *burleſquing* the Scripture; for he directs his Readers to page 62, 63, *&c.* of my Book, for an example of my *ſacrilegious abuſe of the words of Scripture, to make my Readers ſport, and to render my Adverſaries ridiculous*: and whoever conſults the place, will only find a Scheme of their Divinity, expreſſed in their own canting phraſes, without any Art to make it look ridiculouſly, but only a true and naked repreſentation of it; and though I cannot

cannot deny, that it is a famous Example of burleſquing the Scripture, yet Mr. *Fergu-ſon* ought to have laid the Saddle upon the right Horſes back, and then I doubt his own dear Friends muſt ſuffer under this Imputation.

There is nothing I more heartily deſigned, than to reſcue the Scripture from ſuch Abuſes, as appears from what I immediately added, *That the whole Myſtery of this, and a great deal more ſtuff of this nature* (not of * *Fanaticiſm*, as he cites my words, purpoſely to create the greater odium, which is very familiar with him, and agreeable enough to the *purity of his Chriſtian Morals*) *conſiſts in wreſting metaphorical and alluſive expreſſions to a proper ſenſe: When the Scripture deſcribes the Profeſſion of Chriſtianity, a ſincere Belief and Obedience to the Goſpel, by having Chriſt, and being in Chriſt, and coming to him, and receiving him; theſe men expound theſe phraſes to a proper and natural ſenſe, to ſignifie I know not what unintelligible Union and ſpiritual Progreſs and Cloſure of the Soul with him; an Union of Perſons, inſtead of an Agreement in Faith and Manners.* If this be to *burleſque* Scripture, to deliver it from the Freaks of an Enthuſiaſtick Fancy, and to expound it to a plain and eaſie ſenſe, ſuch as is agreeable to the Underſtandings of men,

Knowledg of Chriſt, p. 108.

* Intereſt of Reaſon &c. p. 278.

men, and worthy of the Spirit of God, I acknowledge the Charge, and am afraid my Adverſaries will never be guilty of that Crime.

Thus when I ſhew how convincingly theſe men prove their darling Opinions from a fanciful Expoſition of Scripture-Metaphors, and Types and Figures, and among the reſt obſerve, how many pretty Reſemblances of Chriſt, Mr. *Watſon* has diſcover'd in the *brazen Serpent*, (wherein Mr. *Ferguſon* himſelf acknowledges he has
Ib p.383. *prevaricated*) I am charged with deriding the Type it ſelf, and making ſcornful Reflections upon the main ſcope and deſign of the compariſon: *T. W.* among other things tells us, that *as the Serpent was lifted up to be look'd upon by the ſtung Iſraelites, which looking implied a ſecret hope they had of cure; ſo if we do but look on Chriſt fiducially, we ſhall be cured of our ſins*: by which compariſon he would prove, that becauſe the Iſraelites were miraculouſly cured only by looking upon the brazen Serpent, that therefore there is nothing more required of us to be cured of our Sins, but only looking *fiducially* on Chriſt, that is, confidently hoping to be ſaved by him; this, Mr. *Ferguſon* ſays, is parallel to the words of our Saviour, and the true intendment and meaning

ing of them, *John* iii. 15, 16. *And as Moſes lifted up the Serpent in the Wilderneſs, even ſo muſt the Son of man be lifted up, that whoſoever believeth in him ſhould not periſh, but have everlaſting life*: And now I will acknowledge that I have done very ill in ranking this compariſon of *T. W*'s, among the reſt of his *Prevarications*, if Mr. *Fergnſon* can prove, that this *believing* ſignifies no more than this *fiducial looking on Chriſt*, which I am ſure he can never prove, except it be in Mr. *Watſon*'s way.

What he adds about Mr. *Tho. Vincent* is ſufficiently anſwered already, and ſhall be conſidered in another place. This is the ſum of his Charge againſt me, for *burleſquing* Scripture; in which I cannot think he was ſerious, but only ſaid this, becauſe he muſt ſay ſomething, and had nothing wiſer to ſay: Or as it is with ſome ſcolding people, who wanting wit to make proper and ſudden Repartees, chuſe rather than to ſay nothing, to ſay the ſame things, which were ſaid to them; though the impropriety of the application, and the dullneſs of it, ſerve only to make mirth for the by-ſtanders.

This, I perceive, is Mr. *Fergnſon*'s peculiar Talent; and to give him his due, he is very dexterous at it, as will appear in two

two or three inſtances more of a like nature.

I charge ſome of the Nonconformiſts (for I never thought them all guilty of it) with perverting the Scripture by expounding *alluſive* and *metaphorical expreſſions to a proper ſenſe*; Mr. *Ferguſon* dares not deny this Charge, for the matter of fact is too evident; but he ſhews great Skill in retorting it, and gives ſeveral inſtances, how I pervert Scripture in the ſame manner.

Ib. p. 285.

Thus he tells his Readers, "That "whereas other Expoſitors of Scripture "have expounded Chriſts being called *The "Brightneſs of his Fathers Glory, and the ex-"preſs Image of his Perſon*, Heb. i. 3. in a "plain and proper ſenſe, and have accor-"dingly argued from it for the Deity of "Chriſt againſt the *Socinians*, Mr. *Sherlock* "by Chriſts being ſtiled the Brightneſs of "his Fathers Glory, *&c. underſtands no "more* but thoſe Diſcoveries which "Chriſt hath made of God, being as true "a Repreſentation of the Divine Nature "and Will, as any Picture is of the Per-"ſon it repreſents. When he ſays I underſtand *no more* by it, he expreſly contradicts my own words, which are theſe: *Upon which account too (as well as with reſpect*

to

*to his Divine Nature*) *he is called the brightneſs of his Fathers glory*, &c. So that I acknowledge, that Chriſt is called *the brightneſs of his Fathers glory*, as well with reſpect to his Divine Nature, as to the glorious Revelations of his Will; and for Mr. *Ferguſon* to ſay I do not, and upon that account to inſinuate ſo foul a Charge as *Socinianiſm*, others would have called a wilful and malicious lye. Knowledg of Chriſt, p. 32.

But ſuppoſe the worſt, that I had expounded Chriſts being called *the brightneſs of his Fathers Glory*, &c. only with reſpect to thoſe glorious Diſcoveries he hath made of God, he might have ſaid, it had been a falſe and dangerous, and *Socinian* Expoſition, or what he pleaſed; but it is a very unhappy inſtance of *abuſing the Scripture to a metaphorical ſenſe, where the words, according to all Rules of Expoſition, will admit a proper one*: for I would deſire Mr. *Ferguſon* to tell me, what is the *proper* ſenſe of *the Brightneſs of Gods glory, and the expreſs Image of his Perſon*: What is the *proper brightneſs* of a Spirit? Nay, the brightneſs of the *Glory* of God, and the *Image* of an *infinite* Spirit, which hath no ſhape? I never met with any Expoſitor till now, who thought theſe proper Expreſſions, but every one hath reckon'd them metaphorical:

cal: But beſides this, why does he imagine, that Wiſdom, and Goodneſs, and Power, and Juſtice, and ſuch-like Perfections of the Divine Nature, are but the *metapherical Glory* of God? And that thoſe glorious Diſcoveries, which God hath made of theſe Perfections in Chriſt, are but a *metaphorical Brightneſs of this Glory?* When we never read of any other Glory of God in Scripture, except it were ſome glorious viſible Appearance, which is much more likely to be a metaphorical glory, than the eternal and infinite Perfections of the Divine Nature. And the ſame anſwer will ſerve for what he alledges about Chriſts being the Image of God.

But he tells us, *That Grotius and Hammond, Perſons to whom* (as he well gueſſes) *I pay a reſpect, vouchſafe us a much better Paraphraſe*, on *Heb.* i. 3. I ſhall be very glad to learn from theſe men, and firſt let us conſult Dr. *Hammond*, and his Paraphraſe upon thoſe words, *The brightneſs of his glory, and the expreſs Image of his Perſon*, is this, *Who being the means of reflecting to us the ſight of him, who is otherwiſe inviſible*: for the explication of which, he refers us to *John* i. 18. *No man hath ſeen God at any time, the only begotten Son, who is in the boſom of the Father*,

*ther, he hath declared him*: and his Paraphraſe on theſe words, whereby we may know what the Doctor means by *reflecting the ſight of God to us*, is this: *God is inviſible, and not approachable by us, and ſo his will, and the knowledge of his Attributes cannot be conveyed to us but by ſome Interceſſor, and of this ſort none can be comparable to Chriſt Jeſus, who is next unto the Father, and moſt dearly beloved by him, and knows moſt of his mind; and his end of coming into the World was to declare this unto us.* So that Dr. *Hammond* gives no better Paraphraſe, but in part the very ſame, which I do, and muſt paſs for a *metaphorical* Interpreter, and Mr. *Ferguſon* for a *proper* Slanderer. And *Grotius* gives the very ſame account of the words: He expounds the ἀπαύγασμα τ δόξης, *the brightneſs of his glory*, by *repercuſſus Divinæ Majeſtatis, qualis eſt Solis in Nube, qui dicitur παρήλιος*, "A reflection of the Divine Ma-"jeſty, ſuch as we may ſometimes ob-"ſerve of the Sun in a Cloud: and adds, "That this Divine Glory and Majeſty, *cum per ſe conſpici nequeat, cernitur in Chriſto, ſicut Sol, quem directe oculi noſtri tueri nequeant, cernitur in Aqua, Speculo, Nube*: "Since "we cannot immediately ſee it, as it is in "it ſelf, is diſcovered in Chriſt; as the "Sun, which we cannot directly view, is

" ſeen in Water, in a Glaſs, or in a Cloud: and for the underſtanding of this, refers us to 2 *Cor.* iv. 4. *Who is the Image of the invisible God*; which he thus paraphraſeth: *Nimirum ſicut ex imagine hominis ſpecies cognoſcitur, ita ex iis, quæ egit & locutus eſt Chriſtus, Dei Potentia, Sapientia, Sanctitas, Bonitas.* " As a Man is known by his Image and " Picture, ſo is the Power, Wiſdom, Ho- " lineſs, Goodneſs of God, known and " diſcerned by thoſe things which Chriſt " did and ſpoke, while he was on Earth. And the very ſame account he gives of *Col.* i. 15. What excuſe Mr. *Ferguſon* can make for this, I know not; though I preſume, that he, who ſo often needs Excuſes, is never without one.

But to requite him for his civility to *Grotius* and *Hammond*, I will direct him to two other Perſons, to whom, I ſuppoſe, he will pay ſome reſpect, who are as *metaphorical* men in this point, as my ſelf, and they are no leſs men than *Calvin* and *Beza*. Mr. *Calvin*, though he acknowledges, as I do, that thoſe Expreſſions, *The brightneſs of his Glory, and the expreſs Image of his Perſon*, refer to the Divine Nature in Chriſt, yet he tells us, that we muſt conſider this Phraſe, according to the ſcope and deſign of the Apoſtle: *Neque enim*

Vide *Calvin* in locum.

*enim hic tradere voluit, quid ſimile intus habeat Pater cum Filio, ſed quemadmodum dixi, fidem noſtram ædificare cum fructu voluit, ut diſcamus non aliter Deum nobis patefieri, quam in Chriſto.* *i. e.* "That the Apoſtle did not intend in "this place to acquaint us, what internal "ſimilitude or likeneſs there is, between "the Father and the Son; but to teach "us that which is for the edification of "our faith, that God cannot be known "any other way, but only in Chriſt. With more to the ſame purpoſe.

*Beza* exactly follows his Maſter, and gives this interpretation of the *brightneſs of his glory*; *Is in quo reſplendet gloria illa ac Majeſtas patris alioqui infiniti & inconſpicui, ſive is, in quo uno ſplendorem ſuum conſpiciendum præbet Pater, qui propterea Col.* i. 15. *dicitur imago Dei inconſpicui, & 1 Cor.* iv. 4. *idque in Evangelio.* That is, "He in whom the "Glory and the Majeſty of the Father, "who otherwiſe is infinite and inviſible, "ſhines forth, or he in whom alone God "makes his own brightneſs and glory vi- "ſible to us, upon which account, *Col.* i. 15. "Chriſt is called *The Image of the inviſible* "*God*, and 1 *Cor.* iv. 4. with reſpect to "thoſe Diſcoveries he hath made of God "in the Goſpel: ,, And as he proceeds, "We cannot truly contemplate the Fa- "ther,

*Beza* in locum.

"ther, but in the Son, in the Son, I ſay, "incarnate, by whom the Father ſpeaks "to us. And he alledges the Authority of *Tertullian*, *adverſus Praxeam*, for this Expoſition: *Vicarium ſe Patris Chriſtus oſtendit, per quem Pater & videretur in factis, & audiretur in verbis, et cognoſceretur in filio facta et verba patris adminiſtrante*: "Chriſt ſhewed "himſelf the true Vicar of his Father; "for the Father was ſeen in his Actions, "heard in his Words, and made known "by that whole Oeconomy, which was "adminiſtred by the Son. By this we may ſee what credit Mr. *Ferguſon* deſerves, when he talks ſo confidently of the ſenſe of Ancient and Modern Expoſitors, who either is acquainted with none of them, or thinks his Readers are not; who either knows not, or cares not, what he ſays.

In the next place he obſerves, that I expound *the Fulneſs of Chriſt*, *John* i. 16. to ſignifie a perfect Declaration of the Divine Will concerning the Salvation of Mankind, and he gives this as another inſtance of my *turning plain Scripture Teſtimonies into Tropes and Figures*. Now whatever becomes of this Expoſition, (of which more hereafter) did ever any man before Mr. *Ferguſon*, imagine, that the *Fulneſs of Chriſt*,

*The Intereſt of Reaſon in Religion*, p. 257.

*Chriſt, of which we receive Grace for Grace*, was a proper Expreſſion, without the leaſt Trope or Figure? Fulneſs properly belongs only to ſpace, as filled with matter, and is a metaphorical Expreſſion, when applied to Spirits, or ſpiritual things: and therefore I thought that inſtead of turning a proper Expreſſion into Tropes and Figures, I had expounded a figurative Expreſſion to the moſt proper ſenſe, when by the Fulneſs which is in Chriſt, I underſtood the moſt perfect Knowledge of the Divine Will; and by this Fulneſs communicated to us, the moſt perfect Declarations of the Divine Will in the Goſpel, which is a Diſpenſation of Grace and Truth.

But let us conſider what proper work Mr. *Ferguſon* makes of it: *By that Fulneſs in Chriſt, of which we all receive Grace for Grace*, he underſtands *a participation of renewing ſanctifying Grace, according to the plain and proper import of the words*: So that Chriſt is in a proper ſenſe full of renewing and ſanctifying Grace, that is, according to Mr. *Ferguſon*'s notion of it, of infuſed habits of Grace; and we receive this renewing Grace out of Chriſt's Fulneſs, as Water flows out of a Fountain: And thus either Grace paſſes from one Subject to another,

which the Philoſopher would have told him, no Habit or Quality can do; or the very Subſtance of Chriſt is communicated to Chriſtians, together with theſe infuſed Habits of Grace, which is a more ridiculous conceit than the Popiſh *Tranſubſtantiation*, or the Lutheran *Conſubſtantiation*: The inherent Grace of Chriſt, according to this notion, is of the ſame identical nature with the infuſed Habits of Grace in Chriſtians, and the Eſſential Holineſs of Chriſt is ſeparable from his Perſon, and may be tranſmitted into another Subject, and may there be capable of increaſe and diminution: Mr. *Ferguſon* muſt neceſſarily allow all this, if he take theſe words in a proper ſenſe; for it is not ſufficient to ſay that Chriſt is endowed with power to renew and ſanctifie us, to deliver this Expreſſion from Tropes and Figures, but the very ſame Grace which is in Chriſt, muſt be infuſed into Believers; which is an excellent way of expounding Scriptures to a proper ſenſe, by turning them into Nonſenſe.

But theſe are but ſome ſlight Skirmiſhes; in pag. 387. he draws forth his whole ſtrength and force to make good this Charge againſt me, *That I pervert the Scripture, by turning Plain and Proper Expreſſions*

*preſſions into a Metaphorical Senſe.* Of this he gives two inſtances, the firſt is concerning the Prieſtly Office of Chriſt, which he ſays, I confound with his Regal Office, and conſequently make Chriſt only a *metaphorical Prieſt*; and then he tells us, *That there is not one Text in the Bible, where Chriſt is called a Prieſt, which can be underſtood in a proper ſenſe, but they muſt all of neceſſity be interpreted in a metaphorick*, as the *Socinians* expound them: Now though I doubt it would puzzle Mr. *Ferguſon* to give an intelligible account what he means by a *proper* and a *a metaphorical Prieſt*, yet at leaſt one might reaſonably expect from him, that in order to make good this Charge, he ſhould produce ſome expreſs place where I make Chriſt a metaphorical Prieſt, or ſome expreſs Texts, which I expound to ſuch a metaphorical ſenſe; but he can do neither of theſe, and therefore he firſt perverts my words, as well as ſenſe, and then argues by conſequence, that I make Chriſt only a metaphorical Prieſt, and then by as good conſequence, I muſt expound thoſe Texts, which concern the Prieſthood of Chriſt, in a metaphorick ſenſe; and thus by conſequence our Author loſes his labour: For I have already made it ſufficiently appear, how Ib. p. 399.

childiſhly he has miſtaken, or maliciouſly perverted my words, and ſenſe, whereon this Charge is grounded: only I am very glad to find upon this occaſion, that he has ſo much alter'd his Judgment of Dr. *Stillingfleet*, and his *Diſcourſe concerning the Reaſon of the Sufferings of Chriſt*: for time was, when he charged that Learned Perſon with betraying the Cauſe, for the ſame Reaſons, for which I am now charged with *Socinianiſm*: But our Author never commends any one, unleſs it be to inſinuate ſome commendation of himſelf, or to reflect ſome diſparagement and odium upon his Adverſary.

Ib. p. 403. His next inſtance concerns that account which I give of the nature of Juſtification. And here he firſt lays down my ſenſe of it, and then makes ſome few cavilling exceptions againſt it; & then admirably proves, that I pervert plain and proper expreſſions of Scripture to a metaphorical ſenſe. As for the firſt, I own my words, but diſlike that blundering method, into which he has caſt them; and therefore I ſhall beg leave to repreſent my own Conceptions in ſuch order and method, as may more eaſily and naturally expreſs my ſenſe.

I aſſert, That our Juſtification and Acceptance with God, depends wholly upon the

the Gospel-Covenant, which does not exact from us a perfect and sinless Obedience, but promises Pardon of Sin and Eternal Life, upon the Conditions of Faith, and Repentance, and new Obedience; that this Gospel-Covenant is wholly owing to the Merits of Christ, who by the Sacrifice of his Death hath expiated our Sins, and both in his Life and Death hath given a Noble Demonstration of his entire Obedience and Submission to the Divine Will: for God being well pleased with the Obedience of Christs Life, and with the Sacrifice and Expiation of his Death, entered into a New Covenant of Grace and Mercy with Mankind: that the only way to partake of the blessings of this New Covenant, is by believing and obeying the Gospel of Christ; that is in other words, by acknowledging the Divine Authority of our Saviour, believing his Revelations, obeying his Laws, trusting to the Merits of his Sacrifice, and the Power of his Intercession, and depending on the supplies and influences of his Grace: So that the Righteousness of Christ is not the formal cause of our Righteousness or Justification, but the Righteousness of his Life and Death is the meritorious cause of that Covenant, where-

whereby we are declared righteous, and rewarded as righteous Perſons: our Righteouſneſs is wholly owing to the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, which in this ſenſe may be ſaid to be imputed to us, becauſe without this Covenant of Grace, which is founded on the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, the beſt man living could lay no claim to Righteouſneſs, or future Glory. The Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is our Righteouſneſs, when we ſpeak of the Foundation of the Covenant, by which we are accepted; but if we ſpeak of the Terms of the Covenant, *i. e.* What it is that will intitle us to all the Bleſſings of the Covenant, then we muſt have a Righteouſneſs of our own, for the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt will not ſerve the turn.

This is a plain and eaſie Account of my ſenſe concerning the Doctrine of Juſtification by Faith in Chriſt, and to this I will ſtand. Let us hear then what Mr. *Ferguſon* has to object againſt it. And firſt he

Ib. p. 406. can by no means underſtand *how the Righteouſneſs of Chriſts Life and Death can be the meritorious cauſe of Gods forgiving our ſins and follies*, (he ſhould have ſaid, of that Covenant, wherein God promiſes to forgive our ſins upon certain Conditions) *forafmuch as* (according to what I expreſs elſewhere)

where) *his Eſſential Goodneſs obliged him to it.* The words which he cites to this purpoſe, are theſe : *That the natural notions, which men have of God, aſſure them, that he is very good, and that it is not poſſible to underſtand what Goodneſs is, without pardoning Grace.* Now I would know of Mr. *Ferguſon* which of theſe three he will reject ; whether he will deny, that the natural notion of a Deity includes infinite Goodneſs ; or that the notion of infinite Goodneſs includes Pardoning Grace, when there is a juſt and honourable occaſion for it ; or that the Merits of Chriſts Life and Death have purchas'd the Grace and Mercy of the Goſpel : If he believe all theſe, he is as much concerned to anſwer this Objection, as I am ; if he deny them, he muſt either turn Atheiſt or *Socinian :* But pray, who told him, that the Goodneſs of God did immediately *oblige* him to pardon Sinners? or that the Goodneſs of *God* confers an *antecedent title* on Sinners to Grace and Pardon? May not a good God conſult the Reputation of his Holineſs, and of his Authority and Government, and diſpence his Pardons in ſuch prudent Methods as his own Infinite Wiſdom ſhall direct? And may he not then require the intervention of a Sacrifice, and of a very meritorious

ritorious one too, to purchaſe and ſeal his Pardon to Sincers? The Eſſential Goodneſs of God only proves, That he *may* pardon Sin without a Sacrifice, but it does not prove, that either he *will* or *muſt*.

The next Exception is very ſurprizing, That becauſe I elſewhere aſſert, *That the whole Myſtery of the Recovery of Mankind conſiſts only in repairing the Divine Image, which was defaced by Sin, that is, in making all men truly good and vertuous*, &c. *He cannot imagine, how the Covenant of Grace can be ſo much as neceſſary to the promiſing of Remeſſion of Sins, much leſs that the Death of Chriſt was needful to procure it to that end.* But pray why ſo? Is not the Promiſe of Pardon purchas'd and ſealed with the Blood of Chriſt, abſolutely neceſſary to encourage men to be good? Does not the Goſpel repreſent this to be the laſt and ultimate end of what Chriſt hath done and ſuffered to reſcue Mankind from the Power of the Devil, and Dominion of their Luſts, and to renew them after the Image of God? If Mr. *Ferguſon* be ignorant in theſe matters, I can direct him to a * very good Book, which will better inſtruct him. But ſuppoſe he know no other end of Chriſts Death, *but to ſatisfie a natural vindictive*

* *The Deſign of Chriſtianity.*

*dictive, inexorable Juſtice*, yet if this muſt be done, before any thing elſe can be done, is it not abſolutely neceſſary to the laſt and ultimate end, which is to transform men into the Image of God, and to bring them to the fruition of him? For the ſatisfaction of Juſtice, in what ſenſe ſoever he pleaſes to underſtand it, can only be a means in order to the Recovery of loſt Man, not the Recovery it ſelf.

In the next place, he tells us, *That it* P. 409. *ſeems inconſiſtent with the Wiſdom and Sapience of God, to introduce a perfect Righteouſneſs, ſuch as that of his Son was, meerly to make way for his juſtifying us upon an imperfect Righteouſneſs, ſuch as that of our Obedience is.* What force there may be in that phraſe of *introducing a perfect Righteouſneſs*, I cannot tell, but I can diſcover no inconſiſtency with the Wiſdom of *God* to accept & reward thoſe, who are ſincerely but not perfectly righteous, for the ſake of one, who is. If God beſtowed ſo many Bleſſings on the Poſterity of *Abraham*, for the ſake of their Father, who was not perfectly righteous, I wonder our Author ſhould think it any derogation to the Divine Wiſdom, to accept and reward our imperfect Obedience for the ſake of the perfect Righteouſneſs & Obedience of Chriſt. Nay, though we ſhould ſuppoſe, that

that *God* had ſent *Chriſt* into the world upon no other deſign, but to ſet a moſt perfect Example of Holineſs & Obedience to the Divine Will; and to give a plain Demonſtration, how highly he is pleaſed with Obedience to his Laws, ſhould not only greatly reward him in his own Perſon, but ſhould promiſe for his ſake to pardon and reward all thoſe, who imitate (though imperfectly) his Example, (which in our Authors Phraſe, is to introduce a perfect Righteouſneſs, meerly that he may juſtifie us upon an imperfect one) this would be no greater blemiſh to the Wiſdom of God, than it is to chuſe fit and proper ways of expreſſing his love to Holineſs, and encouraging the Obedience of his Creatures.

But our Author proceeds very Rhetorically: *Nor ſhall I argue how that the Righteouſneſs of Chriſts Life, and Sacrifice of his Death, muſt be imputed to us for Juſtification, in proportion to our Sins having been imputed to him, in order to his Expiatory Sufferings.* He may argue thus, if he pleaſes, and I ſhall perfectly agree with him in it. Let us then conſider how he manages this Argument. *Chriſts Sufferings muſt not be attributed meerly to Gods Dominion, without any reſpect to Sin*: This I grant; *therefore our*

*ſins*

*ſins were imputed to him, not only in the effects of them, but in the guilt*: This I ſo far grant, that the Sufferings of Chriſt had reſpect to the guilt of our Sins, otherwiſe he could not have been a Sacrifice for Sin; but whereas he adds, *That it is a thing utterly unintelligible* (I hope Mr. *Ferguſon* thinks it never the leſs true for that) *how Chriſt could be made ſin for us, and have our puniſhment transferred to him, without a previous imputation of ſin, and the derivation of its guilt upon him.* I am ſo far of another mind, that I think it unintelligible how it ſhould be ſo: for (beſides that guilt cannot be transferred upon an innocent Perſon, though puniſhment may) I cannot underſtand how Chriſt ſhould ſuffer for *our* ſins, if the guilt of our ſins were transferred upon himſelf: if he died for *our* ſins, it is plain that the guilt is accounted *ours* ſtill, though the puniſhment be transferred on him: And this is eſſential to the nature of a Sacrifice, that it dies not for it ſelf, but for another, and therefore not for its own, but for anothers guilt, continuing anothers: Chriſt was no *Sinner* in any ſenſe, but a *Sacrifice for Sin*, which differ juſt as much as bearing the guilt, and bearing the puniſhment of ſin.

Were our ſins transferred on Chriſt in Mr.

Mr. *Ferguſon*'s way, ſo that our ſins become his, and that he may be called a *Sinner, nay the greateſt of Sinners*, the neceſſary conſequence of this Doctrine would be, that we are not delivered from the guilt and puniſhment of our ſins by the *Death of Chriſt*, which the Scripture every where aſſerts, but by the *tranſlation of our ſins on him*: When our ſins are transferred on Chriſt, we are *ipſo facto* innocent, and his Death cannot deliver us, who are freed already, but muſt be only to deliver himſelf from this aſſumed guilt; we are freed by the transferring of our guilt on Chriſt, and Chriſt is freed by undergoing the puniſhment of ſin: As if any man ſhould be ſo kind as to take my Debt abſolutely upon himſelf, if the Creditor accept of this exchange, I am finally diſcharged, and am not liable to any farther Arreſt or Action at Law; and whenever he pays the Debt, he does not free me, but himſelf from the Obligation.

So that now his Argument from Proportion falls to the ground, *That if our ſins were imputed to Chriſt, otherwiſe than meerly in the Effects of them, ſo muſt likewiſe the Righteouſneſs of his Life, and the Sacrifice of his Death be otherwiſe imputed to us, than meerly in the Benefits of them:* For as Chriſt was not

not accounted a Sinner, by the imputation of our ſins to him, ſo neither ſhall we be accounted formally righteous, by the imputation of his Perſonal Righteouſneſs to us.

His next Argument is, *That ſecluding not only the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt's Life, but the Satisfaction of his Death, as the matter, and the imputation of it, as the formal cauſe of Juſtification, it ſeems repugnant to the Immutability and Eſſential Holineſs of God, to juſtifie us upon an imperfect Obedience, the Law which requireth a perfect, remaining ſtill in force, and denouncing wrath in caſe of every failure*: The ſum of which *Argument* is this, That it is unjuſt for God to forgive us our ſins, though Chriſt hath died to make Atonement for them, unleſs we be made formally righteous by the imputation of his Righteouſneſs to us; which in plain terms overthrows the Goſpel of Chriſt, and makes the Sacrifice of his Death of no value: for if Chriſt have expiated our ſins by his Death, why may not God accept and reward our imperfect Services, without being unjuſt in doing ſo?

But that *Law which requireth perfect Obedience remains ſtill in force, and denounceth wrath againſt every failure*: But is there any Law which forbids God to pardon ſin, though his own Son make atonement for

it by his Death? Where is this Law? And where is the Sanction of it? And who gave it this Sanction? Will nothing ſatisfie the Law but perfect and unſinning Obedience? Then there can be no Goſpel, then God never can forgive ſin, and it is a vain thing to talk of it: We may be Righteous by an imputed Righteouſneſs, (were it poſſible for God to judge otherwiſe of things, than they are) but our ſins can never be forgiven; which is a direct contradiction to the whole Goſpel. A Law in force, which will not admit of Pardon and Forgiveneſs upon any terms, is inconſiſtent with Goſpel-Grace; and therefore had not Mr. *Fergusſon* told us, that the *Socinians* aſſert the abrogation of the Sanction of the Law upon the confirmation of the Goſpel-Covenant, I ſhould have been inclined to have thought ſo too: for I cannot underſtand how it is poſſible to reconcile a Law, which requires unſinning Obedience under the pain of Damnation, with the Goſpel, which promiſes Pardon of ſin and eternal Life, upon the condition of ſincere Obedience, which are at as great a diſtance as a neceſſity of Pardon, and a neceſſity of Innocency. And now I think of it, there is no danger of *Socinianiſm*, if we do but attribute ſuch an abro-

abrogation of the Law (if it may be ſo called) as well as the Sanction of the Goſpel, to the Merits of Chriſts Death and Sufferings; and therefore I boldly aſſert, That there is no ſuch Law now in force, as requires unſinning Obedience under the penalty of Damnation. Not that Chriſt hath in a proper ſenſe abrogated the Law by his Death, if by the Law we mean thoſe Eternal Rules of Righteouſneſs, which neceſſarily reſult from the nature of things, and their mutual relations and reſpects, that is, that he has not made that to be no ſin, which according to the Eternal Rules of Righteouſneſs was a ſin; as Mr. *Ferguſon* childiſhly argues, *That then it would follow, that by being Believers, we wholly ceaſe to be Sinners; and that the Goſpel inſtead of only making proviſion for the remiſſion of ſins againſt the Law, hath prevented the breaches of it from being ſo.* Ib. p. 415. But the only abrogation of the Law is, That we ſhall not be judged or condemned according to the Rules of a perfect and unſinning Obedience; that Chriſt having made Atonement and Expiation for our ſins, God will now for the ſake of Chriſt pardon the ſins of true Penitents, and reward their ſincere, though imperfect Obedience. This is the Goſpel-Covenant, which was purchaſed

chaſed and ſealed with the blood of Chriſt, which does not make that to be no ſin, which before was a ſin, but only abſolves us from the condemnation due to ſin, and entitles us to thoſe Rewards which an imperfect Obedience cannot merit.

Perfect Obedience is the Attainment at which we muſt aim, but not the Rule by which we ſhall be judged: There is no other Law now in force to Chriſtians, but the Goſpel of our Saviour, which is the Chriſtian Law, and is the Perfection and Advancement both of the Law of Nature and the Law of *Moſes*; and this Law requires a perfect, but accepts and rewards a ſincere Obedience: it does not come ſhort of any Law in the perfection of its Rules, and it excells all other Laws as it is a Diſpenſation of Grace: For though the Goſpel requires both a perfect and ſincere Obedience, yet it requires them under very different Sanctions, at leaſt if Promiſes may be called the Sanction of a Law: The Sanction of Sincerity is the Promiſe of Eternal Life; nothing leſs than this, will deliver us from the wrath of God, or procure our admiſſion into Heaven; by this Rule we ſhall be judged, as to our final ſtate of Happineſs

or

of Misery. But the Sanction of Perfection consists in the greater degrees of Glory: He who is sincere, though imperfect, shall be saved according to the terms of the Gospel, but our Reward shall be proportion'd to our different Attainments, and the greatest Glory is reserved for the most perfect Saint. And now I hope Mr. *Ferguson* will be satisfied, that it is not *repugnant to the Immutability and Essential Holiness of God, to accept and reward a sincere though imperfect Obedience*; since he does not absolve his Creatures from any essential part of their Duty, but is so merciful, as for the sake of Christ to pardon and accept sincere Penitents; and so holy, as to encourage the most perfect Vertue with the promise of proportionable Rewards.

As for what Mr. *Ferguson* adds concerning Christs *Surrogation in our room and stead*, which makes all *his Acts and Sufferings in a Law-sense accounted ours*; before he had laid too much weight and stress on this Argument, he ought first to have proved, that Christ acted as our *Substitute*, in all that he did, as well as suffered, and he might have tried his Skill in answering those Arguments wherewith I have already assaulted that Notion; but this is not

Ib. p. 411.

Knowledg of Christ, p. 288. Edit. 2. p. 201.

his way, it is more agreeable to his Genious and Capacity to dictate Magisterially, than to prove.

Christ indeed died as a Sacrifice for our Sins, and in this sense suffered in our stead, but his suffering in our stead is a plain demonstration, that his sufferings are not accounted ours, any otherwise than as we receive the benefit of them, in the expiation and forgiveness of our sins, which is the proper effect of Sacrifices, and redounds to them for whom the Sacrifice is offered; which is all I can understand by any sufferings, which are not ours, being accounted ours in *a Law-sense*; for any other sense implies a contradiction, that any sufferings, which are not under-gone by us, but by another in our stead, should be accounted ours, any otherwise than as we receive the benefit and advantage of them: And this is what the Learned Bishop *Davenant* understood by *Imputation*:

*Davenant de gratia habituali. Cap. 17.* *De facto imputantur (extrinseca) quando illorum intuitus & respectus valent nobis ad aliquem effectum, aequè ac si à nobis vel in nobis essent*: "Then those things, which are without "us, and do not properly belong to us, are "said to be imputed to us, when with re"spect to them, we are equally intitled to "their effects, as if they had been done by "us,

"us, or were inherent in us. But such a Surrogation and Imputation, will not satisfie Mr. *Ferguson*, who must have the *Righteousness of Christs Life, and the Sacrifice of his Death, otherwise imputed to us, than meerly in the benefits of them*: Though any other imputation is impossible, as implying a *Thwacking Contradiction*, to use his own phrase.

Having thus got rid of these Objections in a fair *Logical Way*, according to Mr. *Ferguson*'s desire, and not called, but proved them all to be meer *cavil, and sophistry, and vulgar talk*; I come now to the main Charge which he draws up against me, of *perverting the plainest Scriptures into Metaphors*. And in order to make good this Charge, he premises two things: First, *That to Justifie, is in its proper acceptation a forensick term, signifying to acquit and absolve one that is accused*: This I readily grant. P. 413.

The second is, *That Justification not only supposeth us to be indicted, but withal imports an absolution from the Charge of that Law, of the breach whereof we are accused*: I don't much care, if I grant this too; but then observe the consequence, the Law, which accuseth us, is the Law of perfect and unsinning Obedience, and therefore if we would be acquitted and absolved from the Accusa-

tion of the Law, we must produce a perfect and unsinning Obedience for our Justification: for to be pardoned is not a proper, but a metaphorical Justification; for in propriety of speech, *neither can an accused Innocent, by being acquitted be said to be pardoned, nor a condemned Criminal, by having the execution of his sentence remitted, be said to be justified*: So that to our proper Justification from the Sentence of the Law, is necessarily required an Imputation of the perfect Righteousness of Christ to us, to make us perfectly righteous; but to place Justification in the Pardon of Sin, (as I do) is to pervert plain Scripture into Metaphors, for then *Justification, as it is opposed to the accusation of the Law, its charging us with guilt, and its passing Sentence of Condemnation against us thereupon, doth not admit a proper sense in the whole Scripture, but must every where be construed metaphorically; and that the import of it is, that we are not properly and in a Law-sense justified, but that such Benefits accrue to us by remission of sin, as if we were so.* And now I pity our Author with all my heart, for he hath run himself into a labyrinth, out of which all his Art and Sophistry can never deliver him.

The only Foundation he has to bear up the weight of this Charge, is, That the

Law

Law of perfect and unſinning Obedience is ſtill in force; but I have already ſhewed the weakneſs and vanity of this pretence, and how inconſiſtent it is with the Goſpel-Covenant; and therefore I need add no more in vindication of my ſelf: for take away this Law of perfect Obedience, and Mr. *Ferguſon* himſelf acknowledges that according to my notion, *in reference to the demands of the Goſpel, we may in a proper ſenſe be ſaid to be juſtified.* So that I am whole again all on a ſudden, and the only difference between Mr. *Ferguſon* and my ſelf is, that he contends for the neceſſity of a legal Righteouſneſs and Juſtification, and I contend for an Evangelical Righteouſneſs; he is for being juſtified by the Perſonal Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, I am for being juſtified according to the gracious terms and conditions of the Goſpel, which are founded on the Merits and Righteouſneſs of Chriſt. P. 416.

But let us ſuppoſe for once, that this Law of perfect and unſinning Obedience, is ſtill in force, and does accuſe us, and that our Juſtification muſt reſpect the Sentence of the Law; what then? Why then, to place Juſtification in pardon of ſin, is to make it not a proper but metaphorical Juſtification; and what then?

If

If this be the Scripture-notion of it, I matter not, whether it be proper or metaphorical: the abuſe of Scripture-expreſſions does not conſiſt in expounding Scripture either to a proper or to a metaphorical ſenſe, but in wreſting metaphorical and alluſive expreſſions to a proper ſenſe, when they ought to be taken metaphorically, and proper expreſſions to a metaphorical ſenſe, when they ought to be expounded to a proper ſenſe. And this Mr. *Ferguſon* himſelf acknowledges, when he gives ſome Rules for the Expoſition of Scripture, which are generally good, when he tranſcribes them out of other men: *I call that* (ſays he) *the literal ſenſe of Scripture, which God doth intend in the words, whether the words be taken properly or tropically. That which ariſeth from a figurative acceptation of the words, is as truly a literal ſenſe, as that which flows from their proper acceptation.* And therefore he ought to have prov'd, not only that I take Juſtification in a metaphorical ſenſe, but that the Scripture, when it ſpeaks of the Juſtification of a Sinner before God, uſes that word in a proper ſenſe, for *Acquitting the Innocent*, which is a pretty odd way of Juſtifying a Sinner. But here our Author is very ſilent, and cannot give one inſtance of it, only he tells

Chap. 1. p. 135.

tells us, *That in this ſenſe it muſt be taken, when declarative of the Act of God towards us, as our Judge, or when ſet in oppoſition to condemnation, or the curſe of the Law to which we are obnoxious*: But what need of that? Does it not as much belong to a ſupreme and unaccountable Judge to pardon, as to abſolve? And is not Pardon as properly oppoſed to Condemnation, as Abſolution is?

But to let all this paſs, it is worth conſidering, how our Author in his way can explain Juſtification in a proper ſenſe: He tells us, that the proper notion of Juſtification, is *to acquit and abſolve the Innocent*; ſuppoſe this to be true, (though it may admit of ſome diſpute, whether this forenſick uſe of the word be its proper ſenſe) I would willingly learn of our Author, how a Sinner can be juſtified in this proper ſenſe; that is, how he, who hath broken the Laws of God, can be acquitted and abſolved as innocent; how God, who cannot lie, can declare, that that man hath never broken his Laws, nor done any thing amiſs, who is a Sinner: Yes, ſays our Author, this may be done very well by the imputation of the perfect Righteouſneſs of Chriſt to Sinners, which makes them perfectly innocent; ſuppoſe this to be

true,

true, yet is this the proper notion of Juſtification, that a Sinner is innocent and righteous by *Imputation?* Is there no difference then between an *imputed*, and an *inherent and perſonal* Righteouſneſs? Juſtification in a proper ſenſe requires a Perſonal Righteouſneſs and Innocency, and I doubt it will require ſome good luſty tropes to make an imputed Righteouſneſs the matter of our Juſtification in this Law-notion. So that for ought I can ſee, the imputation of Righteouſneſs in his groſs notion, is as metaphorical a Juſtification as the Pardon of ſin, though not half ſo good ſenſe.

But I have not thus done with our Author; There are three things more, which I would deſire him to conſider at his leiſure, and to anſwer when he is able.

The firſt is this, That Pardon of Sin, whether it be a proper or metaphorical Juſtification, is the true Scripture-notion of the Juſtification of a Sinner: Juſtification indeed in its full extent and latitude, ſignifies the acceptation of our Perſons, and the reſtoring us to a ſtate of Grace and Favour with God, which is ſomewhat more than bare Remiſſion; but the firſt Act of Juſtification on Gods part, and that which draws all the reſt after it, is the

Pardon

Pardon of our Sins; this is a Sinners Righteouſneſs, wherewith he muſt appear before God: This is the Commiſſion which Chriſt gave to his Diſciples, *To preach Remiſſion of Sins in his Name*; this is the great Priviledge of the Goſpel, that *now by Chriſt all that believe, are juſtified from all things, from which they could not be juſtified by the Law of Moſes*, Act. xiii. 39. That is, that now Chriſt hath made atonement and expiation for thoſe ſins, for which the Law of *Moſes* did appoint no Sacrifice: Where to be juſtified, ſignifies to be delivered from the guilt and condemnation of Sin, that is, to be pardoned.

But not to heap up many Teſtimonies, I ſhall principally inſiſt on the Fourth Chapter to the *Romans*, as being the proper Seat of this Controverſie. There St. *Paul* enquires by what means our Father *Abraham* was juſtified before God? And in anſwer to it he tells us, that *Abraham* was not juſtified by Works, but by Faith: Where by Works, the Apoſtle does not mean only the Works of the *Moſaical* Law, an External and Ceremonial Righteouſneſs, for he proceeds to that in the tenth verſe, but he ſeems principally to intend a perfect and unſinning Righteouſneſs:

neſs: Let us then examine what the Apoſtle means by Juſtification by Faith, what this Righteouſneſs of Faith is, as it is oppoſed to a Righteouſneſs of Works; and there are four expreſſions whereby this Righteouſneſs is deſcribed, which ſignifie one and the ſame thing. That it is an imputed Righteouſneſs, *verſ.* 3, 6. that it is a Righteouſneſs without Works; that it is a Juſtification of the ungodly, *verſ.* 5. that it conſiſts in the Pardon of Sin, *verſ.* 7, 8.

I ſhall begin with the laſt, becauſe this is Mr. *Ferguſon*'s grand Charge againſt me, That *I place Juſtification in the forgiveneſs of Sin*; but ſo does our Apoſtle, and alledges the Authority of the Prophet *David* for it: *Even as David alſo deſcribeth the bleſſedneſs of that man unto whom God imputeth Righteouſneſs without Works, ſaying, Bleſſed are they, whoſe iniquities are forgiven, and whoſe ſins are covered; Bleſſed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute ſin*, verſ. 6, 7, 8.

This is the Juſtification of Faith, in oppoſition to Juſtification by Works, that thoſe who heartily believe in God as *Abraham* did, though they have been formerly guilty of many ſins, and are ſtill ſubject to many infirmities and defects, yet God for Chriſts ſake will forgive their paſt ſins, and

and their preſent imperfections, and will reward them above the Deſerts and Merits of their Works. A Righteouſneſs of Works conſiſts in Innocency and Perfection, but a Righteouſneſs of Faith in Sincerity and Pardon.

Upon this account it is called an imputed Righteouſneſs, Faith was *accounted* and *reckoned* to *Abraham* for Righteouſneſs, and *bleſſed is the man to whom the Lord imputeth Righteouſneſs*: Which ſignifies, that this is matter of Grace, not of Debt; *for to him that worketh, is the reward reckoned not of Grace, but of Debt.* When a man is juſtified by Works, he is abſolved becauſe he is innocent, and rewarded becauſe he hath merited a Reward, (which is the Juſtification for which Mr. *Ferguſon* pleads, in a direct oppoſition to St. *Paul*) but Juſtification by Faith requires the favour and acceptance of God, becauſe though it includes an honeſt and ſincere mind, and a readineſs to do our beſt to pleaſe God, yet it is conſiſtent with a great many infirmities, and miſcarriages, and defects, which cannot paſs the trial of ſtrict Juſtice: and this is imputed Righteouſneſs, when God accepts of that for our Righteouſneſs and Juſtification, which in a ſtrict ſenſe is not Righteouſneſs: Whatever is imputed to

us

us for Righteouſneſs, muſt be good, but imperfect: If it be not good, it is no part of Righteouſneſs, and therefore cannot be imputed inſtead of the whole; and if it be perfect, there is no need of this gracious acceptation; it is then a ſtrict and proper, not an imputed Righteouſneſs.

Upon the ſame account it is called a *Righteouſneſs without works*, verſ. 6. Which muſt not be underſtood in ſuch a looſe ſenſe, as if God would juſtifie a man, who does nothing which is good, as if he would account that man righteous, who does no Righteouſneſs, which is expreſly contrary to the Doctrine of St. *John*, 1 *Epiſt.* iii. 7. But the meaning is, either that God ſometimes accepts of great and generous Acts of Faith, inſtead of Works, when there is no occaſion or opportunity of Action; which was the caſe of *Abraham*, when he believed *in hope againſt hope*, that he ſhould have a Son in his old Age; to which the Apoſtle principally refers in the 5th verſe, when he tells us, *That to him that worketh not, but believeth, his Faith is counted for Righteouſneſs*: Or elſe *a Righteouſneſs without works*, ſignifies a Righteouſneſs without the Perfection of Works; and therefore the Apoſtle makes a Righteouſneſs without

Without Works, the ſame with an imputed Righteouſneſs, and both of them to conſiſt in forgiveneſs of ſins; *even as David alſo deſcribeth the bleſſedneſs of that man, to whom the Lord imputeth Righteouſneſs without Works, ſaying, Bleſſed are they whoſe iniquities are forgiven, and whoſe ſins are covered.* So that forgiveneſs of ſins, which ſuppoſeth an imperfect and defective Righteouſneſs, if we will believe our Apoſtle, is a deſcription of Righteouſneſs without Works.

Upon the ſame account it is called Juſtifying the Ungodly, *verſ.* 5. which can by no means ſignifie, that God will juſtifie a wicked man, while he continues wicked; for this is a plain contradiction to the whole Goſpel; but it ſignifies, that God will juſtifie thoſe, who though they have been wicked (which was the caſe of *Abraham* and the Gentile-World) yet return to him by a hearty Repentance, and a true lively Faith. Juſtification by Works requires a perpetual Innocency and Blameleſneſs of Life; for a man, who ever was a Sinner, can never be juſtified by Works in this ſenſe, becauſe he can never be innocent again; it being impoſſible that that ſhould never have been, which has been: But now the Righteouſneſs of

Faith, which consists in the forgiveness of sins, makes him Righteous, who has been a Sinner, and is still an imperfect Saint; not that such a man never was a Sinner, but that God doth not impute his sins to him.

This is the Apostles account of Evangelical Righteousness and Justification, that it is an imputed Righteousness, a Righteousness without Works, a Justifying the Ungodly, or which is the sum of all, that it consists in the Pardon of Sin: And now let our Author tell the Apostle, That this is to turn plain Scripture into Metaphors, and that it is inconsistent with the *Immutability and Essential Holiness of God.*

But secondly, I have something more to say to Mr. *Ferguson*, which I suppose will be of some weight with him, *viz.* That all the Reformed Churches are for that Metaphorical Justification which he rejects; that is, they place our Justification in the forgiveness of sin. Thus the *French Church* declares in her Confession, which *Beza* presented to *Charles* IX. in the Name of that Church: *Credimus totam nostram justitiam positam esse in peccatorum nostrorum remissione, quæ sit etiam, ut testatur David, unica nostra felicitas: i. e.* "We believe that "our

Gallicana Conf.

"our WHOLE RIGHTEOUSNESS "conſiſts in the pardon of our ſins, which "alſo, as *David* witneſſeth, is our ONLY "Bleſſedneſs: —— *In ſola Jeſu Chriſti obedientia prorſus acquieſcimus, quæ quidem nobis imputatur, tum ut tegantur omnia noſtra peccata, tum etiam ut gratiam coram Deo naniſcamur.* "And we reſt wholly in the Obedience "of Jeſus Chriſt, which is imputed to us, "both that all our ſins may be covered, "and that we may obtain grace and fa-"vour with God. By which laſt words we learn, what they and other Proteſtant Churches mean by the Imputation of Chriſts Righteouſneſs, and reſting on the Obedience and Righteouſneſs of Chriſt; not that his Righteouſneſs is ſo imputed to us, as to make us formally righteous, and to anſwer the demands of the Law, which exacts an unſinning Obedience; but it is ſo imputed to us, that for the ſake of Chriſt, God forgives our ſins, and receives us into favour.

Thus the *Helvetian* Confeſſion tells us, *Juſtificare ſignificat Apoſtolo in diſputatione de Juſtificatione, peccata remittere, à culpa & pœna abſolvere, in gratiam recipere, & juſtum pronunciare.* "To juſtifie, according to the "Apoſtles ſenſe of it in his diſpute of Ju-"ſtification, ſignifies to forgive ſins, to "ab- Confeſſ. Helvet.

" abſolve from guilt & puniſhment, to re-
" ceive into a ſtate of favour, and to pro-
" nounce ſuch a perſon juſt and righteous:
that is, not juſt as an innocent, but as a pardon'd man.

*Scoticana Confeſſ.* Nor is the *Scotch*-Confeſſion more Orthodox in this point: For giving an account of thoſe benefits we receive by the Satisfaction and Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, it ſums them up in this: *Deus Pater nos in corpore Jeſu Chriſti Filii ſui intuetur, imperfectam noſtram obedientiam quaſi perfectam acceptat, omniaque opera noſtra, quæ in ſe multis maculis fœdantur, perfecta juſtitia filii ſui tegit. i. e.* " God the Father beholds us as Mem-
" bers of Chriſts Body, accepts our imper-
" fect Obedience, as if it were perfect,
" and covers all our works, which in them-
" ſelves are defiled with many ſpots and
" blemiſhes, with the perfect Righteouſ-
" neſs of his Son. So that according to the ſenſe of this Church, to which our Author ought to pay ſome Reverence, we are not acquitted and abſolved as innocent Perſons, by the Imputation of Chriſts perfect Righteouſneſs, but for Chriſts ſake God accepts our imperfect Obedience, as if it were perfect: and covers all the imperfections and defects of our Works with the perfect Righteouſneſs of his Son; that is,

is, pardons all our ſins, for the ſake of Chriſts perfect Righteouſneſs.

The *Auguſtan* Confeſſion is very expreſs in this matter, and ſo is their Apology: *Conſequi remiſſionem peccatorum eſt juſtificari, juxta illud, beati quorum remiſſæ ſunt iniquitates:* "To obtain the pardon of ſin, is to "be juſtified; according to that ſaying, "*Bleſſed are they whoſe iniquities are forgi-*"*ven.* Apol. pro Confeſſ. *Auguſt.*

Thus the Churches of *Bohemia* declare their ſenſe: *Per Chriſtum homines gratis fide in Chriſtum, per miſericordiam juſtificari, ſalutem & remiſſionem peccatorum conſequi:* "That to be juſtified, is to obtain the "pardon of ſin, and ſalvation freely by "Chriſt. *Bohæmica* Confeſſ.

Thus we read in the *Dutch* Confeſſion: *Credimus omnem felicitatem noſtram ſitam eſſe in peccatorum noſtrorum remiſſione, quæ eſt in Chriſto Jeſu; eaque unica totam noſtram juſtitiam coram Deo contineri:* "We believe, that "our whole Happineſs conſiſts in the for-"giveneſs of ſins, which is by Jeſus "Chriſt, and that in this alone conſiſts "our WHOLE Righteouſneſs before "God. *Belgica* Confeſſ.

And to conclude with our own Church, in the Homily of Salvation, we are taught, that *our Juſtification conſiſts in the forgiveneſs*

Homily of Salvation, Part 1.

*of ſin; and that this Juſtification and Righteouſneſs, which we ſo receive of Gods Mercy and Chriſts Merits, is taken, accepted, and allowed of God for our perfect and full Juſtification.*

I do not urge the Conſent of Reformed Churches, as if I thought their Authority ſufficient to determine us in this matter: they had no Authority but Reaſon and Scripture, nor did they pretend to any other; which is the true Principle of the Proteſtant Reformation.

There are but three ſorts of Authority of any moment in Religion, *viz.* The Authority of Divine Inſpiration, the Authority of Teſtimony, and the Authority of Diſcipline and Order.

The Authority of Divine Inſpiration is peculiar to Chriſt and his Apoſtles, who ſpoke by an Infallible Spirit, and is now confined to the holy Scriptures, which are the only Infallible Rule of Faith and Manners: The Authority of Teſtimony is proper only to thoſe Ages which immediately ſucceeded the Apoſtles; for it may reaſonably be preſumed, that thoſe Perſons who convers'd with the Apoſtles themſelves, or convers'd with thoſe who convers'd with the Apoſtles, who underſtood the Phraſe and Dialect of

that

that Age, and those particular Controversies and Disputes which were then on foot, may be able to give us a better account of the traditionary sense of Scripture, and of the practice of the Apostles, than those who lived in after-Ages; and upon this account the Writings of those who lived in the first Centuries, have always had a just Esteem and Authority in the Christian Church; but still the more Ancient they are, the greater is their Authority; and the farther they are removed from the Fountain of Tradition, so their Authority lessens.

The Authority of Discipline and Order, is that Authority which every particular Church has over her own Members; or which the Universal Church, represented in General Councils, has over particular Churches: For while we live in Communion with any Church, we oblige our selves to submit to its Government, and at least so far to receive those Doctrines which she owns, as not to disturb Publick Peace and Order by our Private Disputes.

But in all other cases, he has the greatest Authority, who has the best Reason, and it is a childish thing to urge the bare Authority of any Man or Church, when it

hath neither Scripture nor Reaſon to ſupport it.

So that I do not urge the conſent of theſe Reformed Churches upon account of any inherent Authority, but to make it appear how vainly Mr. *Ferguſon* brags, when he charges me with oppoſing the received Doctrines of Proteſtant Churches. For indeed thoſe Doctrines, which I oppoſe, are meer Novelties, and were never publickly owned by any Reformed Church, and never had any greater Authority, than what an Aſſembly of Divines, and an Ordinance of Parliament could give them.

He who underſtands, what notion the firſt Reformers had of juſtifying Faith, that it is *fiducia miſericordiæ propter Chriſtum*, a firm and ſtedfaſt belief and hope, that they ſhould find mercy with God for Chriſts ſake, can never imagine that they once dreamt of ſuch an Imputation of Chriſts Righteouſneſs to them, as ſhould make them ſtand in no need of Mercy; or of ſuch a *Juſtification as is the Off-ſpring of Juſtice, and imports one tranſacting with us in a Juridical way, without the infringement of Law or Equity*, in oppoſition to *Pardon and Remiſſion, which is the reſult of Mercy, and the act of one exerciſing favour*; which is Mr. *Ferguſon's*

P. 417.

*Ferguſon*'s Account of it, in his own words.

But thirdly, As this Notion of Imputation has no Foundation in Scripture (as I abundantly proved in my former Diſcourſe, of which our Author takes no notice, and it was very wiſely done of him, for I am ſure he cannot anſwer it) ſo it overthrows the principal Doctrines of the Goſpel, and contradicts its main deſign. I ſhall briefly name ſome few. Knowledg of Chriſt, p. 235, &c. & p. 279. Edit. 2. p. 164. & 195.

Firſt, Juſtification by a perfect Righteouſneſs is inconſiſtent with pardon and forgiveneſs: Mr. *Ferguſon* acknowledges, *That to juſtifie and to pardon, are wholly diſtinct in their Natures and Ideas, and always ſeparated in the caſes of ſuch as are arraigned at humane Tribunals, ——and that thus it is in the actings of God too*: Now I wonder he did not conſider, that by the ſame reaſon, the ſame ſubject is not capable of both: He who is univerſally juſtified in our Authors notion, that is, who is acquitted and abſolved in a Juridical way, *i. e.* as perfectly innocent and righteous, needs no pardon, nor is he capable of it, becauſe he has no ſins to be pardon'd: and he who is pardon'd, cannot be juſtified in this ſenſe, becauſe Pardon ſuppoſes him a Sinner, and Juſtification ſuppoſes him innocent, which Intereſt of Reaſon &c p. 416.

hath

hath ſome little appearance of a Contradiction. So that the Goſpel-way of Juſtification, which is by Pardon and Forgiveneſs, is quite diſcarded, and we are juſtified by a legal Righteouſneſs, or by the Works of the Law; that is, by a perfect and unſinning Obedience, though the Apoſtle tells us, *That by the works of the Law no fleſh ſhall be juſtified*: for though this perfect Righteouſneſs whereby we are juſtified, be not our own, but the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt imputed to us, yet it is the Works of the Law ſtill, which is an expreſs Contradiction to the Apoſtles Doctrine: And I wonder, what our Author thinks of all thoſe Promiſes of Pardon, which are contained in the Goſpel, and which are the greateſt ſupport and comfort of Sinners, when it is impoſſible to find any place for them in his New-Goſpel.

Secondly, This notion of Juſtification overthrows the Neceſſity and Merit of Chriſts Death and Sacrifice: the vertue of a Sacrifice conſiſts in the expiation and forgiveneſs of ſin; but now if Juſtification excludes Pardon, there is no need of a Sacrifice; if nothing will ſatisfie the demands of the Law, but a perfect and unſinning Obedience, then there can be no Sacrifice for ſin, or at beſt it is to no purpoſe

poſe, for it cannot ſatisfie the Law, and therefore not expiate our ſin; and if Chriſt have ſatisfied the Law by his perfect Obedience, there is no reaſon why he ſhould ſuffer the penalty; for no Law can oblige us both to obey it perfectly, and to endure the Penalties for the breach of it, though we do perfectly obey it: So that if Chriſt died for our ſins, and if remiſſion of ſins muſt be preached in his name, then we are not perfectly righteous by the imputation of his Righteouſneſs, but muſt obtain the pardon of our ſins through Faith in his Blood.

Thirdly, This notion of Juſtification deſtroys the Grace and Mercy of God in the Juſtification of a Sinner: This Mr. *Ferguſon* expreſly owns, That *Pardon* indeed (if there could be any ſuch thing) *is the reſult of Mercy, but Juſtification is the Off-ſpring of Juſtice, and imports Gods tranſacting with us in a Juridical way, without the infringement of Law or Equity:* And I know not any aſſertion, which more expreſly deſtroys the Grace of the Goſpel: Whereas St. *Paul* attributes our Juſtification as well as Pardon, to the Grace of God: *We are juſtified freely by his Grace, through the Redemption that is in Chriſt Jeſus.* Nor will it relieve him to ſay, that our Juſtification is an Act of Grace,

Grace, becauſe though we are juſtified in a proper Law-notion by a perfect Righteouſneſs, yet this Righteouſneſs is not inherent, but imputed, which is an act of Grace: for beſides that this implies a contradiction, to be juſtified in a *proper* Law-ſenſe, by an imputed, that is an *improper* Righteouſneſs, and that God proceeds *in a Juridical way, without the infringement of Law*, and yet admits of ſuch a Righteouſneſs as not the Law, but only Grace can accept; I ſay, beſides this, we may for the very ſame Reaſon ſay, that Pardon is an act of Juſtice, becauſe it is purchas'd by the Death of Chriſt. And therefore if our Author would make good his notion, he muſt ſhew how Pardon is more an act of Grace, than Juſtification; and how Juſtification is more the Offſpring of Juſtice, than Pardon; and if he dare ſtand to this notion, there needs not many words to prove, that he overthrows the whole Grace of the Goſpel.

Fourthly, There is another very ill conſequence of this notion, that it deſtroys the neceſſity of an inherent Righteouſneſs, or of a good Life: For what neceſſity can there be, that we ſhould have a Righteouſneſs of our own, when we are perfectly righteous with the imputed Righteouſneſs

neſs of Chriſt? The Law demands a perfect and unſinning Righteouſneſs, and it is impoſſible it ſhould demand any more; we anſwer this Charge by the perfect Righteouſneſs of Chriſt; and when this is done, we are innocent and righteous, and have a title to the Rewards of a perfect Obedience, and what can be deſired more from us? Mr. *Ferguſon* indeed ſuppoſes that the Law requires a perfect Obedience, and that the Goſpel over and above this requires Faith and a ſincere Obedience: and *that Chriſt was our Subſtitute to make Satisfaction to the Demands of the Law, and not of the Goſpel: And that by his Death he hath only freed us from what we were obnoxious to, upon failure of perfect Obedience; but not at all from what we are liable to, in caſe of Unbelief, and want of ſincere Obedience*: Now though this be true in ſome ſenſe, that is, that Chriſt by his Death hath expiated our ſins, and thereby delivered us from the condemnation of the Law, upon the failure of perfect Obedience, and hath ſealed the Covenant of Grace in his Blood, which accepts and rewards a ſincere though imperfect Obedience; yet as it is applied by him, it is down-right nonſenſe: for if we perfectly anſwer the Demands of the Law, by the imputation of Chriſts

Ibid.

Chriſts perfect Righteouſneſs, there is no need of the Goſpel, nor any place for it: Perfection includes Sincerity, as the greater includes the leſs, and therefore if the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt anſwers the Demands of the Law, as to a perfect Obedience, it ſhuts out any farther Demands of the Goſpel. He who is perfectly righteous, is ſincere too, and he who can anſwer the Demands of Juſtice, needs not the allowances of Grace and Mercy: So that the Imputation of Chriſts perfect Righteouſneſs does ſupercede our own Endeavours, and makes our own Righteouſneſs needleſs: for this Reaſon I charged them before, and do ſo ſtill, with ſetting up the Perſon of Chriſt in oppoſition to his Laws and Religion; with magnifying his Perſonal Righteouſneſs, ſo as to evacuate all the Obligations of Duty. And now methinks I can deal with any thing in Mr. *Ferguſon*, but his Brow and Confidence, who is of the true breed, and can ſtare the Sun in the face without blinking: for after all this he declares, That

P. 550. *let me but once juſtifie my Charge of their making the Perſonal Righteouſneſs of Chriſt our Perſonal Righteouſneſs; or that they maintain, Chriſt to have fulfilled all Righteouſneſs in our ſtead, & he does aſſure me, that he will not only be ready*

*ready to allow my ſevereſt Reproofs, but to commend and ſecond them.* Now unleſs by *Perſonal*, he means *inherent*, nothing in the World can be more plain, then that he himſelf makes Chriſts *Perſonal* Righteouſneſs our *Perſonal* Righteouſneſs: for we are Perſonally Righteous with the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, and anſwer all the Demands of the Law with it, and then I conceive it muſt be a Perſonal Righteouſneſs, not by inheſion indeed, with which I never charged them, but by imputation. And as for Chriſts fulfilling Righteouſneſs in our ſtead, unleſs he has ſome ſecret quirk in that phraſe *our ſtead*, Doctor *Owen* does not only profeſs this, but endeavours to prove it by ſeveral Arguments, that Chriſt did not keep the Law for himſelf, *but for us*, and that not for our good only, but that we might be righteous with his Righteouſneſs, and fulfil the Law in him. He keeps the Law as our Mediator, and Surety, and Repreſentative; and I think that is ſo *for us*, as to be *in our ſtead*: this I have diſcours'd at large in my former Book, and thither I ſhall refer my Reader. Knowledg of Chriſt, P. 296. Edit. 2. p. 207.

Having thus juſtified my ſelf in a proper Law-notion from the Accuſations of this Author, I ſhall farther conſider, how he

he juſtifies his dear Friends the *Nonconformiſts*, from that Charge of toying with Scripture-Metaphors and Phraſes, and turning them into *Burleſque*: And truly he is the moſt wretched Apologiſt that ever I ſaw; ſometimes he acknowledges the Charge with reſpect to particular Perſons, who *through ignorance, inadvertency, or wantonneſs, prevaricate in this matter*; but would not have *the whole Party* (which was never done by me) *traduced for the folly of a few*; but if we ſhould enquire, how few thoſe are who thus prevaricate in this matter, and judge of it by their late Writings, I doubt it would appear by computation, that they never had ſo many *Prevaricators* at *Cambridge*, ſince the firſt Inſtitution of that Order; and then let any one judge, how well this agrees with what he aſſerts in the ſame breath, that *he knows none more obſervant of theſe Rules* (which he had before laid down) *in the ſenſing and applying of Metaphors, than thoſe who are ſtiled Nonconformiſts*; which proves nothing, but that he has very little good Acquaintance.

But indeed Mr. *Ferguſon* has taken the beſt courſe he could: I had ſhewed in particular inſtances, how they had abuſed Scripture-Phraſes and Metaphors, but he did

did not think fit to deſcend to particulars, but inſtead of that, collects a great many good Rules out of *Glaſſius* and *Voſſius*, and tells us how they ought to expound and uſe Metaphors, and then without any farther proof concludes, that they do ſo: Whereas ſhould we ſuppoſe that all the *Nonconformiſts* underſtood the Rules of Rhetorick as well as our Author (though I fear many of them never read ſo much Rhetorick in their Lives before, and I wiſh reading this may do them ſome good) yet it is a very different Art to underſtand the Rules of Rhetorick, & to practiſe them; whether they have any Skill in the firſt, or no, I know not; but I am ſure, if they have, they are as ſaving of it as ever men were, as if they were afraid it would waſte by too common a uſe.

Juſt after the ſame manner he *vindicates the Nonconformiſts from thoſe Aſperſions lately caſt upon them, as if they were Defamers of Reaſon, diſclaiming it from all Concern in Religion, &c.* To wipe off this Reproach, which was not caſt upon them, but which they brought upon themſelves by their perpetual Declamations againſt Reaſon; our Author writes a large Chapter to ſhew the Uſe of Reaſon in Matters of Religion, and this muſt paſs for a Juſtification of the P. 62.

*Nonconformiſts*; and now they will be thought the only Rational Divines: Whereas in truth had he managed this Argument with as much accuracy as he pretends to, he had been ſo far from juſtifying the *Nonconformiſts*, that he had given a fatal blow to thoſe ridiculous People, who declaim againſt the Uſe of Reaſon: But for ought I ſee they may talk at their old rate ſtill, for all Mr. *Ferguſon*.

*Deſinit in piſcem mulier formoſa ſuperne.*

But to wave this, only wiſhing that ſome young Sophiſter (and there are many of them that are equal Matches for this Fanatick Profeſſor) would undertake to correct his inſolent humour, and teach him to treat *Des-Cartes* with greater Reverence: I ſhall only inform him at preſent againſt he writes next, what he ſhould write about; for I find he has abundance to ſay, when it is nothing to the purpoſe, but either does not, or will not underſtand, what he ſhould oppoſe, nor what he ſhould vindicate.

I was not ſo ſilly, as to oppoſe a ſober uſe of Metaphors, no not in matters of Religion, as Mr. *Ferguſon* would fain inſinuate; nor did I concern my ſelf about their

their ſlovenly and *Kitchin-Metaphors*, though it is a great prophanation of ſacred things, to make ſuch groſs and fulſom repreſentations of them, as muſt needs diſguſt more refined and ſpiritual minds, and expoſe Religion to the Scoffs and Drollery of Atheiſtical Wits: But my Quarrel with them is, that they confound and darken the moſt plain and material notions in Religion by metaphorical Deſcriptions, and turn the Scriptures themſelves into an Allegory or Romance: and of this they are guilty ſeveral ways.

Firſt, By thruſting Metaphors into Definitions; this Mr. *Ferguſon* himſelf does in expreſs words condemn, and therefore I would deſire him in behalf of himſelf and his Friends, to give me a Definition of Juſtifying Faith, agreeable to their Principles, without a Metaphor in it: Could I once ſee this, I doubt not but all our Diſputes about Faith and Juſtification would be at an end; and yet this he is bound to do, if he will be true to his own Rules: for he acknowledges, that *every thing ſpoken metaphorically is ſpoken obſcurely, with reſpect to expreſſing the nature of things. And accordingly in aſſigning the definitions of things, metaphorical terms are to be avoided, becauſe as Ariſtotle ſays*, (as Mr. *Ferguſon* P. 320.

might learn from many Modern Authors, without ever seeing *Aristotle*, though he should be so ingenuous as to own his Masters) *they do not declare,* ὅπερ τι ἔστιν, ἀλλὰ ποῖον, *what a thing is, but only what it is like to; when any thing is manifested by a Metaphor, the thing it self is not fully expressed, but only some similitude betwixt it and another.* And what he adds, is so great and useful a Truth, that it is sufficient to expiate all the Fooleries of his Book, because it will confute them all; *That there is not any thing relating to Doctrine or Manners delivered in the Scripture metaphorically, which is not somewhere or other either explicitly or implicitly expressed in terms that are proper, (one place being a Key to the unlocking another.)* And yet after all this, I never could yet hear any thing but Metaphors from these men in their Definitions or Descriptions of Justifying Faith.

Justifying Faith is either *a coming to Christ, or receiving Christ, or embracing Christ, or a looking fiducially on Christ, or leaning, and resting, and rolling on Christ and his Righteousness for Salvation*: Now what are all these, but Metaphors taken from material and sensible things? Which can never give us any intelligible notion of Faith, though they may serve for illustration,

tion, when we first understand its nature.

And yet, as if this were not sufficiently obscure already, most of them make each of these distinct acts of Faith, which in order of nature precede each other: *We must first come to Christ, and then we must receive him, and then we must look fiducially on him, and then we must lean, and rest, and roll our Souls on him, and then we must lay him in our Bosoms, and embrace him in our Arms*: and when we have done all this, we shall be very understanding Believers, if we have but a good Fancy to distinguish between the Legs, and Hands, and Arms, and Eyes, and Bosom of Faith. I do not speak this in Mirth and Drollery, but with a just Indignation to see the Religion of our Saviour transformed into a Work of Fancy, and with a hearty pity for those deluded People who are fed with such thin and airy Notions.

The plain notion of Justifying Faith, stript of all Metaphors and Figures, can be no other than this; Such a firm and stedfast Assent to all the Revelations of the Gospel, as governs our Hearts and Lives by the Laws of it: Or to give a larger Explication of it, It is such an Assent to whatever Christ hath revealed

concerning the Nature and Will of God, or his own Nature, Offices, and Mediation, the Rules of Life and Practice, and the Rewards and Puniſhments of the next Life, as does effectually determine our Wills to the Obedience of his Holy Laws.

*To receive Chriſt in all his Offices*, when it is explained, comes to the very ſame ſenſe; To believe all the Revelations of Chriſt, as he is our Prophet, to acknowledge the Vertue and Merit of his Sacrifice and Interceſſion, as he is our Prieſt; and to expect our acceptance with God for his ſake, upon condition of our obeying his Laws, and ſubmitting to his Government, as he is our King.

But theſe men could never be perſwaded to talk without Metaphors, which would ſpoil all the *Shiboleths* of their Party, and make them look like dull Moraliſts; and yet I ſhall once more challenge Mr. *Ferguſon*, in compliance with his own Rules, to give me a Definition of Juſtifying Faith, agreeable to his notions of Juſtification, without a Metaphor; and if he cannot do this, (as he will be a wonderful man, if he can) I would deſire him to conſider how dangerous it is to tranſcribe good Rules out of good Books,

with-

without understanding the Consequences of them.

Secondly, Another fault which they are guilty of in the use of Metaphors, is, that they expound one Metaphor by another; this Mr. *Ferguson* very justly condemns: *For Metaphors properly signifying one thing, and being applied to signifie another, only because of some resemblance, we are therefore in our sensing of Metaphors to remove the metaphorical term, and to substitute in its room that word which properly signifies the thing, whereof we conceive the former to have been only a figure. To paraphrase Metaphors in metaphorick terms, is instead of making them intelligible, to continue them dark and mysterious.* P. 344. Now if this be a fault, as I perfectly agree with Mr. *Ferguson* that it is, he would do well to correct those men (which might be taken more kindly from him) who do not only explain one Metaphor by another, but pursue a single Metaphor, till they have forc'd it into an Allegory: I gave one short instance of this in my former Discourse, with respect to the Marriage between Christ and Believers. And whereas our Author justifies such Discourses from the Book of *Canticles*, which describes the love of Christ to his Church in such an allegorical manner; in return to this Knowledg of Christ, Chap. 4 Sect. 3. p. 279. Edit. 2. p. 195.

I would offer ſeveral things to his conſideration.

As firſt, I ſuppoſe he underſtands, that there is a vaſt difference between Poetical Deſcriptions, ſuch as the Book of *Canticles* is, and Practical Diſcourſes for the Government of our Lives: the firſt requires more Garniſh and Ornament, and juſtifies the moſt myſterious flights of Fancy; the ſecond requires a plain and ſimple dreſs, which may convey the Notions with eaſe and perſpicuity to the Mind. And therefore that which is not only juſtifiable, but commendable in a Divine Song, which ought to have ſomething Great and Myſterious, and to deſcribe every thing with Pomp and Ceremony, is not only a ridiculous affectation, but a very hurtful vanity in a Preacher, whoſe buſineſs is to inſtruct the Rude and Ignorant, not to amaze and aſtoniſh his Hearers with Poetick Raptures.

And ſecondly, Though I do no more quarrel with Allegories, than I do with Metaphors, which may be of good uſe in their fit and proper places, yet I would deſire our Author to conſider, that there is ſome little difference between an Allegorical Deſcription of things, and an Allegorical Expoſition: It is juſtifiable enough

enough in ſome caſes to deſcribe plain things in Allegories and Parables; but it is a mad way of expounding Religion by turning it into Allegories, which muſt of neceſſity make it obſcure and myſterious. Allegories are of no uſe till they are expounded, and are of a very doubtful ſignification, when we want the true Key of Expoſition; becauſe they being a work of fancy and imagination, may by men of different fancies be expounded to very different and contrary purpoſes; which makes the Song of *Solomon* it ſelf, though the moſt divine and ſpiritual thing that ever was penned under the Jewiſh Church, of much leſs uſe to us, than otherwiſe it might be, as appears from the variety of interpretations, which are given of it: And this is a plain Argument, how injurious theſe men are to Religion, who inſtead of expounding the Myſteries of it, turn them into Allegories, which muſt either be expounded again, or continue obſcure, and expoſe Religion to all the Freaks of an Enthuſiaſtick and Allegorical Fancy.

And thirdly, Our Author may conſider farther, that Allegories are much more improper now under the Goſpel, than they were under the Law; Under the Law God

God inſtructed the Jews by dark and obſcure Types and Figures, but did not think fit to unveil his Glory, and give them a diſtinct and clear knowledge of his Will, and therefore an Allegorical Song was very allowable under the Typical and Ceremonial State of the Church: But ſince Chriſt hath appeared, who is the Brightneſs of his Fathers Glory, and the expreſs Image of his Perſon, who hath given us a plain and perfect Revelation of the Will and Nature of God, an Allegorical Religion is as improper as Jewiſh Types and Ceremonies. It diſappoints one great end of Chriſts coming in the Fleſh, to make his Religion obſcure and myſterious, and to wrap it up in Types and Allegories: And I wonder very much, that theſe men, who are ſo afraid of a ſignificant Ceremony, for fear of returning to a Jewiſh Bondage and Pedagogy, ſhould be ſo fond of an Allegorical and Metaphorical Religion, which is as obſcure and unintelligible, as the Jewiſh Types were. We are not now under a *Canticle*-Diſpenſation, but live under the bright and clear Light of the Goſpel, which is equally clouded by Jewiſh Types and myſterious Allegories.

But to return: It is very eaſie to give many other inſtances of their expounding Metaphors by Metaphors, and I have given ſeveral in my former Diſcourſe: thus Faith is call'd Coming, Receiving, Embracing, *&c.* If you enquire, How all this muſt be done? They tell you, That you muſt come to Chriſt on the Legs of Faith, or be carried to him in the Chariots of Faith, or ſwim to him on the Stream of the Promiſe, and receive him by the Hand of Faith, and embrace him in the Arms of Faith, as good old *Simeon* did: and thus Faith becomes an Inſtrument of Juſtification, and receives Chriſt, who is the Gift of God, as a poor man receives an Alms: Whereas Legs, and Hands, and Arms, and Inſtruments, are as obſcure Metaphors, and need as much explication as Coming and Receiving, *&c.* and yet you muſt never expect any better explication from them; if you preſs them hard, they will tell you, that coming and receiving, *&c.* ſignifies believing; but then if you ask them what believing ſignifies, they are forced to ring the Changes backward, and tell you, that believing is coming and receiving.

Thirdly, Another abuſe of Metaphors is, to argue and reaſon from them, and to

erect

erect ſuch Doctrines on them, as are no where to be found in expreſs words in Scripture: Thus I ſhewed in my former Diſcourſe, how they prove the imputation of Chriſts Perſonal Righteouſneſs to us, from the Laws of Marriage, of Suretiſhip, and the Mediatory Function. "The "Church is Chriſts Spouſe, and as the "Wife by vertue of her Marriage Union "is entitled to her Husbands Eſtate, thus "are Saints by their marriage to Chriſt "entitled to all his Perſonal Fulneſs, "Beauty, Righteouſneſs: And as a Wife "under covert is not liable to an Arreſt, "or Action at Law, but all muſt fall upon "her Husband; ſo you being married to "Chriſt, this ſuperſedes the Proceſs of "the Law againſt you, if it be not ſatisfied, it muſt ſeek its reparation at the "hands of your ſpiritual Husband, Chriſt "himſelf, *&c.*

Chap. 4. ſect. 3.

Thus Mr. *Shephard* argues very comfortably: *That the Husband is bound to bear with the Wife, as the weaker Veſſel, and ſhall we think that God will exempt himſelf from his own Rules, and not bear with his weak Spouſe?* That is, one who hath no ſtrength, no grace, no nor ſo much as ſenſe of Poverty.

Ibid. p. 68. Edit. 2. p. 48.

And

And Mr. *Watſon* argues at the ſame rate, That *Sin it ſelf cannot diſſolve our Union to Chriſt, becauſe we are the Members of his Body, and Chriſt will never loſe a Member.*

And thus they argue from Chriſts being our Surety, that as in the Law, the Debtor and the Surety are but one Perſon, ſo it is with Chriſt and us; for he took our Debt upon himſelf, and upon this Chriſt and we are but one Perſon before God, and accordingly he deals with us; for he makes over our ſins to Chriſt, and Chriſts Righteouſneſs and Satisfaction to us.

At the ſame rate they argue from Chriſts being our Mediator, That Chriſt fulfilled all Righteouſneſs as he was Mediator; and that whatever he did as Mediator, he did it for them whoſe Mediator he was, or in whoſe ſtead, and for whoſe good he executed the Office of a Mediator before God, and hence it is, that his compleat and perfect Obedience to the Law, is reckoned to us.

Now when I had plainly ſhown them how weak and fallacious this way of Reaſoning is, from the Laws of earthly Marriages and Suretiſhip, *&c.* the only anſwer I can get from Dr. *Owen* and his Friends, is,

is, That Christ is not such a Husband, and Surety, and Mediator, as men are, but is all this in an eminent manner; that there is something peculiar in him, which cannot be affirmed of any other. Now this is the answer I desired, but could not hope that they had so little wit as to give it: for this is plainly to acknowledge that all their Arguments are fallacious; for if there be such a vast difference between the Notion of a Husband, and Surety, and Mediator, and the several Duties and Offices of these Relations, as applied to men, and as applied to Christ, then we cannot argue from one to the other: this is plainly to give away the best Arguments they have for the Imputation of Christs Personal Righteousness in their sense, and with them to yield up the Cause. For now before they argue from Christs being our Husband, that therefore we have a title to his Personal Righteousness, as a Wife has to her Husbands Estate, they must prove from express Texts of Scripture, that this is the Law of our spiritual Marriage; before they argue from Christs being our Surety, that therefore we are but one Person with him, and that whatever he did as our Surety, is accounted as much ours, as if we had done it our selves,

ſelves, they muſt prove that this is the Scripture-notion of Chriſts Suretiſhip: and had they taken this courſe, I dare ſay I might have looked long enough for an Anſwer, before it had come.

And here, as not finding a fitter place for it, I ſhall briefly take notice of that Defence which Dr. *Owen* has made for his way of Reaſoning, from Chriſts being our Mediator, to prove the Imputation of his Perſonal Righteouſneſs to us: Though I muſt recal that word *Defence*, for indeed he has made none, but appeals to the ingenuity of his Readers, and leaves his Book to defend it ſelf; which it may be ſuppoſed to be very well able to do at the age of twenty years, eſpecially againſt a young Adverſary.

And firſt he would willingly inſinuate, that I had not truly or fairly related his words, but then on a ſudden he takes courage, and roundly aſſerts, whatever I had charged him with, *That the Lord Chriſt fulfilled all Righteouſneſs as Mediator, and that what he did as Mediator, he did it for them whoſe Mediator he was, or in whoſe ſtead, and for whoſe good he executed the Office of a Mediator before God.* And here he firſt very nicely diſtinguiſhes between theſe two Propoſitions, *Chriſt as Mediator fulfilled all Righteouſneſs* Vindicat. p. 208. P. 209.

*ouſneſs in our ſtead*; and, *Chriſt being Mediator in our ſtead, fulfilled all Righteouſneſs for us*; and very truly obſerves, that I do not underſtand the difference between them; and it would have been charitably done of him to have ſhown the difference, for I am ſtill ſo dull as not to perceive it: If Chriſt as Mediator *in our ſtead* fulfilled all Righteouſneſs for us, then he muſt fulfil it *in our ſtead*; for he is therefore ſuppoſed to fulfil Righteouſneſs *for us*, becauſe he acted *in our ſtead*; which can be no reaſon, unleſs he acted in our ſtead in fulfilling Righteouſneſs, which I think is much the ſame with fulfilling Righteouſneſs in our ſtead. And indeed the Doctor himſelf does expreſly aſſert this in ſo many words,

Commun. P. 184. *That this Obedience was performed by Chriſt, not for himſelf, but for us, and in our ſtead*: So that it ſeems He himſelf did not underſtand the difference of theſe expreſſions then, and I am ſure can ſhow no difference now.

Though I cannot blame the Doctor for being willing to ſhift off this expreſſion, *That Chriſt fulfilled all Righteouſneſs in our ſtead*, as fore-ſeeing the conſequence of it, that this muſt needs diſcharge us from the Obligations of a Perſonal Righteouſneſs: For if Chriſt have fulfilled the Righteouſneſs

ouſneſs of the Law in our ſtead, the Law can no more exact Obedience from us, than it can inflict Puniſhment on us; a perfect Righteouſneſs is all the Law can require of us; and ſince we have perfectly obeyed the Law in Chriſt our Mediator, it can make no farther Demands of us. *Which is to ſet up the perſonal Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, in oppoſition to his Laws and Religion.*

Now as bad a conſequence as this is, if Dr. *Owen* would ſpeak conſiſtently with his own Principles, he can never avoid it; for the foundation of all his Arguments, to prove, that Chriſts Righteouſneſs is made ours in a Law-ſenſe, is, that Chriſt as our Surety and Mediator fulfilled all Righteouſneſs in our ſtead; for take away this, and there is no more reaſon why the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt ſhould in his ſenſe be reckoned ours, than why the Righteouſneſs of *Abraham*, or *Moſes*, or St. *Paul*, ſhould be imputed to us.

And yet ſuppoſing this true, *That Chriſt fulfilled all Righteouſneſs in our ſtead*, it neceſſarily overthrows their fundamental Notion of our Juſtification by the *Imputation* of Chriſts Righteouſneſs to us; for if he did it in our ſtead, it becomes *ours* without an Imputation: It would be neceſſary in-

deed, that God ſhould accept of Chriſt as our Surety and Mediator, to act in our ſtead, which may be reckoned an act of favour, and accordingly that Chriſt ſhould fulfil all Righteouſneſs in our ſtead, but when this is done, there needs no imputation to make it ours. Whatever is done in our ſtead by a Proxy or Subſtitute appointed and allowed to act for us, becomes ours according to ſtrict Law and Juſtice, and needs not the acceptation of Grace and Mercy (which is the Scripture-notion of Imputation) to make it ſo: Chriſts Righteouſneſs would become ours by his acting in our ſtead, without any conſequent Imputation.

And yet (to ſee how Abſurdities multiply!) ſuppoſe we take it in Dr. *Owen*'s ſenſe, that Chriſt is only *a Mediator in our ſtead*; this is a manifeſt contradiction, for it ſuppoſes that the Middle may ſtand in the place of either of the Extreams: for a Mediator is a middle Perſon between two contending Parties, and therefore his Office is to act between them both, and not in the ſtead of either. And to ſay that Chriſt is a Mediator in our ſtead, ſuppoſes that we ought to have been Mediators, that is, middle Perſons between God and our ſelves; nay indeed that we are ſo in the

the Perſon of Chriſt: for otherwiſe, though he may be a Mediator on our behalf, and for our good, yet he cannot mediate in our ſtead.

In the next place I made it appear, that we cannot argue from the general notion of a Mediator, that his Perſonal Righteouſneſs ſhall be imputed to thoſe for whom he is Mediator; *for a Mediator is one who interpoſes between two differing Parties, to accommodate the difference, but it was never heard of yet, that it was the Office of a Mediator to perform the terms and conditions himſelf*, which I ſhewed particularly in the example of *Moſes*. And here the Doctor obſerves firſt, that *I give an inſtance in Moſes, who is called a Mediator in receiving the Law, but did therein no way interpoſe himſelf between differing Parties, to reconcile them*: But was this the only Office of *Moſes*, to receive the Law? Did he not frequently interpoſe between God and the People, and by his interceſſions divert his anger from them? Secondly, he obſerves, *that I would deſcribe the nature of the Mediation of Chriſt, from the nature of the Mediation of Moſes*, which he calls a *Socinian Fiction*; but pray who told him ſo? I only argue from the general notion of a Mediator, which muſt equally agree to all Mediators, whatever other

Knowledg of Chriſt, p. 297. Edit. 2. p. 207.

Vindicat. p. 211.

differences there may be in the nature of their Mediation: and therefore if *Moſes* as a Mediator were not bound to fulfil the Righteouſneſs of the Law for the whole Congregation, neither could Chriſt as a Mediator be bound to this; at leaſt we cannot prove, that he was from the general nature of Mediation; and therefore now the Doctor quits this way of reaſoning, and pretends only to argue *from the ſpecial nature of the Mediatory Office and Work of Chriſt*, and ſo I have obtained all I deſigned by that Argument, *viz.* That the general conſideration of Chriſts being our Mediator, cannot prove that his Righteouſneſs is imputed to us.

In the next place I fairly ſtate what that Righteouſneſs is, which the Doctor ſays, Chriſt fulfilled for us: this he calls *wonderfully perplexing my ſelf in gathering up ſayings backward and forward in his Diſcourſe, to make ſome advantage to my purpoſe*: and I confeſs any man, who reads the Doctors Books with a deſign to underſtand them, and to make ſenſe of them, will find it a very perplexing work: But however I firſt ſhewed, that the Doctor rejects the *habitual Righteouſneſs of Chriſt as Mediator, in his humane nature, from being imputed to us.* Secondly, he rejects the Obedience which he

Vindicat. p. 212.

Knowledg of Chriſt, p. 298. Edit. 2. p. 229.

he yielded *to the peculiar Law of the Mediator, which reſpected himſelf meerly, and contains all thoſe Acts and Duties of his, which were not for our IMITATION*, and inſtances *in his Obedience, which he ſhewed in dying*: though I obſerved, *that St. John the Divine tells us, that we muſt imitate him in this too, muſt lay down our lives for the Brethren, as Chriſt died for us*, 1 John iii. 16. To which the Doctor anſwers, *That we are not ſo to die for any one, as Chriſt died for us*: But what of that? May we not imitate that which we cannot equal? But then thirdly, the Righteouſneſs which is imputed to us, is his Righteouſneſs, *as a man ſubject to the Law*, and now *whatever was required of us by virtue of any Law, that he did and fulfilled, and this is that actual Obedience of Chriſt, which he performed for us.*

Now before I came particularly to examine the Doctors Proof of this, I obſerved by the way, "That this is very ſtrange, "that what he did as Mediator (in Obe- "dience to the peculiar Laws of his Me- "diation) is not imputed to us, but what "he did not as Mediator, but as a man "ſubject to the Law, that is imputed to "us, and reckoned as if we had done it, "by reaſon of his being our Mediator. Here the Doctor charges me, either with

a wilful or ignorant miſtake, for making him to ſay, that what Chriſt did *not as Mediator*, but as a man ſubject to the Law, is imputed to us; whereas he aſſerts, that what Chriſt did as a man ſubject to the Law, he did as Mediator; *for Chriſt was made a private man, as Mediator.* But the Doctor might have obſerved, that I did not report that as his words, but as their natural interpretation, that what Chriſt did *not as Mediator*, but in a private capacity, as a man ſubject to the Law, is imputed to us: for ſoon after I take notice of the reaſon, whereby the Doctor proves, that Chriſt did that *as Mediator*, which did not belong to the peculiar Laws of his Mediation, but was required from him in a private capacity, as a man ſubject to the Law; the ſum of which came to this, that he did it as Mediator, becauſe he was a Mediator who did it; which as the Author of the *Speculum* obſerves, may paſs for a *quâ reduplicativè*; but yet I think the ſubtileſt Schoolmen never argued from one to the other, that whatever a Mediator does, he does as a Mediator, becauſe he is a Mediator who does it.

Vind. P. 217. But *Chriſt was made a private man as Mediator*: This I deny; as Mediator he was a publick Perſon, and nothing belongs to his Media-

Mediation, but what he did as a publick Perſon: But he was made a man then, as Mediator; yes, he was a Mediator in Human Nature, but his taking Human Nature on him, was no part of his Mediatory Office, but a neceſſary preparation for it: And now what follows? That whatever he did as a man, he did as a Mediator? By no means: He was a Mediator in our Nature, but it does not therefore follow, that whatever he does in our Nature, belongs to his Mediatory Office; there is no way to prove this, that I know of, but to return to the old Sophiſm, that he obeyed the Law as Mediator, becauſe he was a Mediator who did it.

So that the whole proof, that Chriſt fulfilled Righteouſneſs for us, as our Mediator, depends upon this, whether he acted as our Mediator in his private capacity, as a Man ſubject to the Law: The Doctor acknowledges, that the general notion of a Mediator includes no ſuch thing, and that this does not belong to the peculiar Laws of his Mediation; for his Obedience to the peculiar Law which required the Publick Acts of his Mediation, cannot be imputed to us: And therefore it all reſolves it ſelf into his Obedience to the Law, as a private man; that is, that he is

our Mediator as a private man, acting in a private capacity; *i.e.* as obeying thoſe Laws of Righteouſneſs, which concern private men. Which is ſo ſtrange at the firſt hearing, that we may well require good proof of it.

But then I obſerved farther, *That it is as ſtrange to the full, that Chriſt ſhould do whatever was required of us, by vertue of any Law, when he was neither Husband, nor Wife, nor Father, Merchant, nor Tradeſman, &c. that he ſhould diſcharge the Duties of theſe ſeveral Relations for us, when he never was in moſt of theſe Relations, and could not poſſibly be in all.*

Ibid. To this, the Doctor anſwers, *That he has frequently ſmiled at this Argument, when he has met with it in the* Socinians, *who are perking with it at every turn; but here it ought to be admired.* I wiſh the Doctor be Orthodox at his heart, for he ſeems to have read none but *Socinians*; and I fear has a deſign to promote *Socinianiſm*, by giving away all good Arguments to them: but to antidote my Readers againſt this, I can aſſure them, that this Argument is uſed by very Orthodox Writers, and derided by *Antinomians*: Though it is ſome queſtion, whether the Doctor ſmiled at the Argument, or at his own Anſwer; however I had

rather

rather he would *ſmile* ſtill, than *admire*, which would be the more effectual Confutation of the two.

But his Anſwer is worth conſidering: *That the Grace of Duty and Obedience in all Relations is the ſame, the Relations only adminiſtring an external occaſion unto its peculiar exerciſe. And what our Lord Jeſus Chriſt did in the fulfilling of all Righteouſneſs in the Circumſtances and Relations wherein he ſtood, may be imputed to us for our Righteouſneſs in all our Relations, every act of Duty and Sin in them reſpecting the ſame Law and Principle.* The meaning of which Anſwer is this, That Chriſt is ſaid to fulfil all Righteouſneſs for us, not becauſe he did fulfil all Righteouſneſs, but becauſe he would have done it, had he been in ſuch Circumſtances and Relations as had required it: and thus he has found out a way how Chriſt may fulfil all Righteouſneſs, without doing any thing at all: for by the ſame Reaſon that he may be ſaid to fulfil the Righteouſneſs of any particular Duties and Relations, without doing it, he may be ſaid to fulfil the Righteouſneſs of all Duties and Relations, without doing any thing: *for the Grace of Duty and Obedience is the ſame in all*: and that does not conſiſt in external Actions, (for then it will equally oblige to every

ry particular act of Righteouſneſs, as to any) but in an inward Principle: and thus the Doctor muſt return to what he had before expreſly rejected, That *the habitual Righteouſneſs of Chriſt as Mediator in his Human Nature*, is the only Righteouſneſs which can be imputed to us: Chriſt did not fulfil all the particular Duties of Righteouſneſs in his actions, becauſe he was not in ſuch circumſtances and relations as required it: and therefore thoſe at leaſt, who are in any condition or relation, in which Chriſt never was, (as the generality of Mankind upon one account or other are) muſt of neceſſity be juſtified not by the imputation of Chriſts actual, but habitual Righteouſneſs.

And now let me reaſon a little with the Doctor in his own way: "Why ſhould "Chriſt live here in the World ſo long as "he did, in perfect Obedience to all the "Laws of God? Had he died before (as "ſoon as he had been born) there had "been perfect Innocency and perfect Ho-"lineſs by his habitual Grace: and this made him fit to be a Sacrifice to expiate our ſins, and would as well ſerve for a perfect Righteouſneſs to cover them: and ſhould he have lived to the end of the World, unleſs he could have run through

all

all the ſeveral Relations and Conditions of Life, he could never actually fulfil all that Righteouſneſs which is required of all Mankind, and therefore the perfect habitual Righteouſneſs of his Nature may as well ſerve for the whole as for a part.

The Doctor in the place, to which I now alluded, can find no other reaſon why Chriſt ſhould live ſo long in the World, in a perfect Obedience to the Laws of God, but only a neceſſity of an actual fulfilling all Righteouſneſs for us, which ſuppoſes that an habitual Grace is not enough; and yet when he is told that Chriſt could not and did not fulfil all Righteouſneſs for us, becauſe he could not diſcharge the Duties of our ſeveral Relations for us, when he never was in moſt of theſe Relations, & could not poſſibly be in all, he anſwers, that there is no need of it, becauſe *the Grace of Duty and Obedience is the ſame in all*: and now how the Doctor can reconcile theſe two, that it is neceſſary actually to fulfil all Righteouſneſs, and that it is not neceſſary actually to fulfil all Righteouſneſs, let him conſider; for I am ſure there muſt be the ſame neceſſi y of fulfilling all Righteouſneſs, that there is of fulfilling any; and he himſelf deſcribes that Righteouſneſs which Chriſt was to fulfil for us, as our Medi- Commun. p. 18.

Mediator, to be, *whatever was required of us by vertue of any Law*: though I ſuppoſe, when he thus ſtated it, he had not met with this *Socinian* Objection, which he will never be able to anſwer otherwiſe than by *ſmiling or admiring*.

In the next place I conſidered thoſe Arguments, whereby the Doctor proves that Chriſt fulfilled all Righteouſneſs for us, as our Mediator. And the firſt is, That Chriſt was under no Obligation to obey thoſe Laws himſelf, and he inſtances both in the Law of Creation, and in the Ceremonial Law given to the Jews.

Firſt to begin with the Law of Creation, that is, all thoſe Duties which neceſſarily reſult from the frame and conſtitution of Human Nature; and becauſe
P. 220. the Doctor in his Vindication hath repreſented the force of his Argument in fewer and plainer words, I ſhall quit the advantages which his perplext and intricate ar-
* P. 185. guings in his Book of * *Communion* give an Adverſary (which I dare venture any man to make ſenſe of, without a comment) and deal with him at the faireſt Weapon.

He proves then, that Chriſts Obedience to the Law of Creation was *deſignedly for us*, by two Arguments: *Firſt, becauſe the way*

*way whereby the Lord Chriſt in his own Perſon became obnoxious and obedient to the Law of Creation, was by his own voluntary antecedent choice, otherwiſe than it is with thoſe who are inevitably ſubject unto it, by natural generation under it*: The meaning of which is, that he conſiders Chriſt antecedently to his Incarnation, when it was in his choice whether he would become Man, or no, and ſo conſequently whether he would be ſubject to the Laws of Human Nature; and I ſay ſtill, the force of this Argument is no more but this, *That Chriſt had not been bound to live like a man, had he not voluntarily choſe to become man*; and the reaſon of that is this, that he could not have lived like a man, had he not been a man.

It was in his choice whether he would become Man, but when he had choſe this, it was not at his liberty to chooſe whether he would ſubmit to the Laws of Human Nature; and it is a new way of reaſoning to argue, that Chriſt was not bound to obey thoſe Laws for himſelf, becauſe he voluntarily choſe ſuch a ſtate, which neceſſarily and without any further choice brought him under thoſe Obligations: Which is juſt as if I ſhould prove, that no man is bound upon his own account to diſcharge the Duties of a Husband, becauſe

cauſe it was at his own choice, whether he would have entered into that Relation, which, when he is in it, neceſſarily exacts ſuch Duties from him.

The diſcharge of his Mediatory Office, neceſſarily required, that he ſhould become man, that he might be our Prophet, and Example, and Guide, our Prieſt, and our Sacrifice, our King and Govetnour; and when he was Man, his Nature required that he ſhould obey the Laws of Creation, and live like a reaſonable Creature.

But the Doctor adds, That *the Hypoſtatical Union in the firſt inſtant whereof the Human Nature was fitted for Glory, might have exempted him from the Obligation of any outward Law whatever.*

What he means by *outward Laws*, I cannot tell, for the Laws of Creation are intrinſick and eſſential to human Nature; and if the Hypoſtatical Union do not deſtroy the Human Nature, it cannot exempt it from thoſe natural and neceſſary Obligations: He might as well ſay, that the Hypoſtatical Union exempts the Human Nature of Chriſt from the Laws of Reaſoning, as from the Rules of Life, both which are equally the Glory and Perfection of a Reaſonable Nature.

And

And though we ſhould ſuppoſe the Human Nature in Chriſt, in the very firſt inſtant of its Union to the Divine Nature to be fitted for Glory, yet I cannot ſee, how this exempts the Human Nature from the Obligation of thoſe Laws which are eſſential to Human Nature, unleſs he thinks that Human Nature in Glory is under no Obligations. Had Chriſt been immediately tranſlated to Heaven, he had not been obliged to thoſe particular inſtances of Obedience, which are proper to an earthly ſtate, for glorified Saints themſelves are not; but while Chriſt is a perfect Man, as well as God, it will always become him in whatever ſtate he be, to live agreeably to Human Nature: For though he be advanced to the Right Hand of God, he is ſtill as man inferiour to his Father, and therefore can never, as man, be exempted from the neceſſary Laws of Human Nature.

But to proceed to the Ceremonial Law: "The Doctor proves, that Chriſt as an innocent man, under the Covenant of "Works, could not be obliged by this "Law, which came upon us by reaſon of "Sin, eſpecially not to ſuch inſtitutions "as ſignified the waſhing away of ſin, and "repentance from ſin, as the Baptiſm of

"*John*

"*John* did, and therefore he fulfilled this "Righteouſneſs for us.

* P. 310. Edit. 2. P. 217. To this I anſwered in my former * Diſcourſe, "That though it were granted, "that theſe Laws at firſt were commanded upon occaſion of ſin, yet an innocent man may obſerve them to good and "wiſe purpoſes, as publick and ſolemn "acts of Worſhip, or external and viſible "expreſſions of Devotion, as a publick "Profeſſion of Righteouſneſs and a vertuous Life; to which purpoſes among "others, the Sacrifices and Ceremonies "of the Law, and the Baptiſm of *John* "ſerved, *&c.*

To which the Doctor returns no anſwer, but makes me ſay what I never thought, and *abuſes his credulous Readers with an apprehenſion that I had talked like himſelf, at ſuch a rate of Nonſenſe as any one in his Wits muſt needs deſpiſe*, to borrow ſome of his own Elegancies. For thus he reports my ſenſe, or words, or both, as he would perſwade his Readers, that I ſay, that an "Innocent Perſon, ſuch as Chriſt was abſolutely, may be obliged for his own ſake, "to the obſervation of ſuch Laws and Inſtitutions, as were introduced by the occaſion of ſin, and reſpected all of them "the perſonal ſins of them that were obli-

Vindicat. P. 223.

"ged

"ged by them. And now he desires to be left to his *liberty, nay to the necessity of his mind, not to believe Contradictions*: I wish he had been under this necessity a little sooner, or were yet under a necessity of not making contradictions: for what he believes, no man can tell.

I plainly acknowledged, that Christ being an Innocent Person, could not observe any of these Judaical Ceremonies, with respect to personal sins; but I say, as they had other significations, so he might observe them to other purposes. Circumcision in its first Institution was a seal of that Covenant which God made with *Abraham*, and therefore did very well become him, who was not only of the Seed and Posterity of *Abraham*, but that very Seed, which was promised in the Covenant, whereof Circumcision was the Seal. The Baptism of *John* was a publick Profession of a vertuous Life, which becomes the most innocent man; but it was a profession of Repentance, and signified the washing away of sin, only when the baptized Person had been a Sinner; and yet the Baptism of our Saviour was designed for a nobler purpose, as a Publick Inauguration of him to his Prophetical Office. The Passover was an Eucharistical Sacrifice, in

commemoration of the Deliverance of their Fore-fathers out of *Ægypt*, and therefore might be obſerved by the moſt innocent man; but I challenge the Doctor or any of his Friends to prove, that Chriſt offered any *Sin or Treſpaſs-Offering*, which reſpect only *perſonal Offences*, or that he obſerved any Ceremony, which could ſignifie nothing elſe but perſonal guilt; and till he can prove this, his Argument is worth nothing.

His ſecond Argument to prove that what Chriſt did as Mediator, (that is, the actual Obedience of his Life) he did for us, and in our ſtead, I repreſented thus: *That there can be no other reaſon aſſigned of Chriſts Obedience to the Law, but only this, that he did it in our ſtead.*

Knowledg of Chriſt, p. 311. Edit. 2. p. 218.

Here the Doctor, according to his uſual way, charges me with miſ-repreſenting his Argument; for his words are, *That the end of the active Obedience of Chriſt cannot be aſſigned to be, that he might be fit for his Death and Oblation.* Theſe I acknowledge to be his words, but not his Argument, for the force of his Argument conſiſts in the diſ-junction, as I expreſly obſerved, that either Chriſt fulfilled all Righteouſneſs to fit him for his Death and Oblation; or he did it for us, and in our ſtead; becauſe otherwiſe, as he himſelf ex-

expreſſes it, *if the Obedience Chriſt performed be not reckoned to us, and done upon our account, there is no juſt cauſe to be aſſigned, why he ſhould live here in the World ſo long as he did in perfect Obedience to all the Laws of God*: and therefore in anſwer to this, I made it appear, that though the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt were ſuppoſed not neceſſary to qualifie him for his Death, (which he can never prove) yet there were other great and neceſſary Reaſons, why he ſhould live ſo long in the World in a perfect Obedience to the Divine Will. Commun. p. 182.

His third Argument to prove that Chriſt performed all Righteouſneſs for us, is, *the abſolute neceſſity of it: for this is the term of the Covenant, Do this and live; ſo that we being unable to yield that compleat & perfect Obedience, which the Law requires, as the condition of Life and Happineſs, it is neceſſary that Chriſt our Mediator and Surety ſhould fulfil the Law for us.* The ſum of which Argument (as I told him before) is this, "That there "never was, nor ever can be a Covenant "of Grace, that God ſtill exacts the rigo- "rous perfection of the Law from us, and "that we muſt not appear before him "without a compleat and perfect Righ- "teouſneſs of our own, or of another: "Now this is the thing in queſtion, whe- Knowledg of Chriſt, p. 315. Edit. 2. p. 220.

"ther we muſt be made righteous with "the perfect Righteouſneſs of Chriſt im- "puted to us, or whether God will for the "ſake of Chriſt diſpenſe with the rigor of "the Law, and accept a ſincere and Evan- "gelical Obedience, inſtead of a perfect "and unſinning Righteouſneſs; *ſo that he* "*only confidently affirms what was in diſpute,* "*and this goes for an Argument:* This Argu- ment he ſilently paſſes over, only he tran- ſcribes the laſt clauſe, without taking any notice of the reaſon of it, and huffs it off with an Appeal to his Reader.

Any man may eaſily gueſs by the ma- nagement of this whole Diſcourſe, that the Doctor had no mind his Readers ſhould know what was in diſpute, or what Arguments were alledged on either ſide; and I do readily believe what he ſays, *That he is weary of every word he is forced to add*, for it is enough to tire any mans heart out, to be forced to ſay ſomething, and not to have one wiſe word to ſay.

But to return from this long Digreſſion, it were very eaſie to give ſeveral other in- ſtances of this way of arguing from Meta- phors; as when they prove, that we are wholly paſſive in our firſt Converſion, be- cauſe we are ſaid *to be dead in treſpaſſes and ſins*,

*ſins*, from whence they infer, that we can contribute no more to our own Converſion, than a dead man can to the quickning of himſelf; and that we are born again, and are made new Creatures, and created to good Works, and the like: but to diſcourſe this fully, would take up too much time, and poſſibly may fall under conſideration in a proper place. What I have already diſcours'd, is ſufficient to acquaint Mr. *Ferguſon* that I am no Enemy to a ſober uſe of Metaphors; and that he and his Friends do very much corrupt Religion, and perplex and entangle the plaineſt notions of it by the abuſe of Scripture-Metaphors.

## CHAP. III.

### *Concerning the* DOCTRINE *of the* CHURCH *of* ENGLAND.

THoſe Objections (if they may be ſo called) of which I have taken notice in the former Chapter, are but ſome ſlight Skirmiſhes, but the main Battel is ſtill behind: the great out-cry is, That I have contradicted the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, contained in her Articles and Homilies: This (I confeſs) were a very great fault, if it were true, and if it be not, it is a very great calumny: And yet whether it be true or falſe, every one may believe as he pleaſes; for the Doctor is not at leiſure to make good the Charge; this he leaves to the Biſhops and Governours of our Church to conſider, which is very wiſely done of him. But *all that he takes leave to ſay, is, That the Doctrine here publiſhed, and licens'd ſo to be, either is the Doctrine of the preſent*

Vind. p. 9.

*ſent Church of England, or it is not: If it be ſo,* what then? Why then *the Doctor ſhall be forced to declare, That he neither has, nor will have any Communion therein.* But I thought there had been no need of declaring this now: If this be all the hurt my Book has done, to force the Doctor to renounce the Communion of our Church, after ſo many years actual ſeparation from it, the matter is not great. But why ſo much haſte of declaring? Why *as for other Reaſons* (at which you may gueſs) *ſo in particular becauſe he will not renounce or depart from that which he knows to be the true ancient Catholick Doctrine of this Church:* What a mighty Reverence has the Doctor for the Church of *England!* That he will rather ſeparate from the preſent Church of *England,* than renounce the Ancient Catholick Doctrine of the former Church of *England!* That he will not renounce any thing, which he knows to have been the True Ancient Catholick Doctrine of this Church! But does he indeed ſpeak as he means? Does he account the Authority of the Church of *England* ſo ſacred, as to make it the Foundation of his Faith, and a ſufficient Reaſon to renounce any Doctrines which ſhe condemns, and to own what ſhe owns? If he does not, I would

desire him to explain the force of this reason, and if he does, I would beg of him for the sake of his Reason to renounce his Schism; though upon second thoughts I fear, this is no good Argument with the Doctor.

Well, *but if it be not so*, that is, if the Doctrine here published, be not the Doctrine of the present Church of *England, as he is assured with respect unto many Bishops, and other learned men, that it is not*; What then? What account will he now give of Renouncing the Communion of this Church? Nay, not a word of that, but he has a little Advice to the Bishops and Governours of it: *It is certainly the Concernment of them who preside therein, to take care, that such Discourses be not countenanced with the Stamp of their Publick Authority, lest they and the Church be represented unto a great disadvantage with many.* What a blessed change has my Book wrought in the Doctor! He is now mightily concerned for the Honour and Reputation of the Bishops and Church, and fears lest they should be disadvantagiously represented to the World. Who could ever have hoped for this, who had known the Doctor in the blessed times of Reformation! And yet I vehemently suspect, that after all his Courtship to the

Church

Church and Biſhops, the Doctor deſigns a little kindneſs to himſelf and his Friends in it, to perſwade the Reverend Biſhops not to ſuffer any *Books* to be Printed againſt them, which they cannot anſwer, which *may repreſent them to a great diſadvantage with many.*

The *Looking-Glaſs-Maker* tranſcribes ſeveral paſſages out of the Homilies, to what end he himſelf knows beſt; for I ſhould not readily have gueſſed my ſelf concerned in them, had it not been for that ingenious Reflection, *How ill Mr. Sher-lock hath fitted his Cloth to this Pattern, he that is not very blind, may ſee*: So that now every one muſt acknowledge for the credit of his eye-ſight, that I have contradicted the Homilies: by which artifice, as I have heard, ſome waggiſh Fellows have perſwaded ſilly People to confeſs, that they have ſeen ſome ſtrange Prodigies, which they did not ſee, and which indeed were not to be ſeen. Spec. p. 30.

But to gratifie the ill nature of theſe men, let us for once ſuppoſe, that which they cannot prove, that I have contradicted the Doctrine of the Church of *England*: what then? Why then I have contradicted the Doctrine to which I have ſubſcribed; if I have done ſo, it is very

ill

ill done of me, but what then? Why then this is a ſufficient Anſwer to my Book: But I pray why ſo? Do they believe the Church of *England* to be infallible? Do they think it a ſufficient proof of the Truth of any Doctrine, that it is the Doctrine of the Church of *England*? Why then do they reject any of the Articles of our Church? Why do they renounce Communion with us? If they attribute ſo much to the Judgment and Authority of our Church, is it not as good in one caſe, as it is in another? Every one, I ſuppoſe, knows, what *Obedient Sons* they are of the *Church* of *England*, how they reverence the Authority of their Mother; and is it not a plain Argument, how hard they are put to it, when they are forc'd to take Sanctuary in the Authority of that Church, which they ſo much reproach and vilifie; when they dare not truſt to any other Weapon to defend their Cauſe, but the deſpiſed name of the Church of *England*? Thoſe I am ſure muſt be very blind, who cannot ſee through ſo tranſparent a Cheat.

The meaning then of all this noiſe about the Church of *England*, is no more but this: They are conſcious to themſelves of a bad Cauſe, which they can no longer

longer defend by plain Scripture and Reason, and therefore ſhelter themſelves in the Authority of the Church, and would fain perſwade the Biſhops and the Church of *England* to defend them, ſince they cannot defend themſelves; and having little elſe to ſay, they make long Harangues about Articles and Homilies, and pretend a mighty Zeal *for the True Ancient and Catholick Doctrine of the Church of England*: And now methinks the Church of *England* and the Reverend Biſhops are very much beholden to me, for they have not had ſo many good words from theſe men in many years before, and muſt never expect the like again, but upon ſuch another occaſion; and I hope the People will begin to conſider, what a Church they have forſaken, whoſe Authority is much greater than all other Arguments with their own Teachers.

But I ſee it is very dangerous to be too much in love with any thing; for this great zeal and paſſion for the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, has betrayed the Doctor, and his good Friend the Author of the *Speculum*, to ſome haſty Sayings, of which, it may be, they may ſee cauſe to repent, when they are better adviſed. They are great Friends, you muſt know,

to

to Liberty and Indulgence, and take it very ill, if they may not only think and act as they pleaſe in matters of Religion, but make Parties and Factions too, and controul the Commands of Secular Powers; and yet theſe very men, who ſo much extol and magnify an Indulgence, and ſo much need it, give plain intimations how far they would be from granting that Liberty to others, which they challenge to themſelves.

Vindicat. p. 82. The Doctor tells me, *There is great reaſon to pity the People committed to my Charge, what regard ſoever ought to be had unto my ſelf:* i. e. though I ſhould ſtarve for want of my *Rectorſhip*, as he expreſſes himſelf elſewhere,

P. 117. *——Had this man in their days treated this Doctrine with his preſent ſcoffing petulancy, he had ſcarce been Rector of St. George Buttolph-Lane, &c.* Nor ſhould I be ſo now, could he hinder it: But what becomes of Liberty and Indulgence then, in matters of Religion? Muſt the Conſcience be ſet free in matters of External Order and Government, but tied up in Doctrines and Opinions? This indeed is the Doctors avowed Principle, as great a Friend as he is to Liberty: He would be excuſed himſelf from ſubſcribing Three of the XXXIX Articles, but as for the other XXXVI, he would have no man ſuf-

ſuffered to live in *England* who will not ſubſcribe them; and the Doctor can remember when he propoſed this very unſeaſonably.

The Author of the *Speculum* deſires his Friend to *bid me conſider, whether if the Parliament ſhould meet, they might not find leiſure enough to cenſure my Diſcourſe, as they did Mr.* Mountague's, *who in vain pleaded for himſelf that he had writ againſt the Puritans; and was left alone to ſuffer, though others had inſtigated him to write: The Commons of England will ſcarce endure to find the Doctrine of the Church of England ſtruck at, though it be through the ſides of Dr.* Owen *and Dr.* Jacomb. But now ſuppoſe the Commons of *England* ſhould think it as reaſonable to ſecure the Government and Diſcipline, as the Doctrine of the Church, what would become then of Indulgence? Would not our Author then change his Note, and repent of ſuch Intimations as theſe? Or if the Commons of *England* ſhould happen to have other thoughts of that Diſcourſe, than our Author has, and ſhould think it neceſſary to prevent the Debauching of Mens Minds by ſuch corrupt Doctrines as are there oppoſed, what would become of moſt of the Conventicles in *England*? Could he with any Confidence then cry out

*Spec.* p. 68.

out of Perſecution, when he himſelf hath ſounded the Alarm to it? This it is to fence with a two-edged Sword, which cuts both ways, and may wound a Friend as ſoon as an Enemy.

This is ſufficient in anſwer to my Adverſaries, who are well skill'd at drawing up a Charge, but have no faculty at proving it. But I think my ſelf upon this occaſion concerned to vindicate the Doctrine of the Church of *England* from the miſ-repreſentations of theſe men, as if it favoured ſuch uncouth and abſurd notions, as beſides the ill conſequences of them, have no foundation in Scripture or Reaſon, which I doubt may repreſent the beſt Church in the World *to great diſadvantage with many*, I mean with all wiſe and conſidering men.

The principal thing which theſe Men object againſt me, is the Doctrine of Juſtification, as it is explained in the Articles and Homilies of our Church. And I am contented the Controverſie ſhould be put upon this iſſue, whether they or I ſpeak moſt conſonantly to the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, in this matter.

The Doctrine of Juſtification is contained in Article XI. which is this:

We

We are accounted Righteous before God, only for the Merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by Faith, and not for our own Merits and Deservings. Wherefore that we are Justified by Faith only, is a most wholsom Doctrine and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification.

The Article is plain, and expressed in a few words, without any Scholastical Subtilties; we are not clogged here with the several Modes of Causality, with the Efficient, Formal, Material, Instrumental Causes of Justification, which fill up every Page in the Books of Modern Divines. All that our Church requires us to profess, is only this, that we are accounted Righteous before God, only by Faith, and for the Merits of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; that neither Faith nor Works are the Meritorious Cause of our Justification, but that all the Merit of it is to be attributed to Christ, who died for our sins, and fulfilled the Law; so that whoever acknowledges the Merits of Christ, and denies the Merits of Good Works, answers the end and design of this

this Article: For this was the great Controverſie of thoſe days, between the Papiſts and Proteſtants, whether we were Juſtified freely by the Grace of God, and the Merits of Chriſt, or by the Merits of our own Works; and the principal deſign of this Article was to oppoſe the Popiſh Doctrine of the Merit of Good Works.

But we are referred to the Homily of Juſtification for a larger Account of this Doctrine, and thither I willingly appeal: And to proceed with all poſſible ingenuity, I readily acknowledge, that there are ſeveral Expreſſions in that Homily, which ſeem to favour that notion of our Juſtification by the Imputation of Chriſts Perſonal Righteouſneſs, (though that phraſe of the Imputation of Chriſts Righteouſneſs, is nowhere uſed throughout the whole Homily) but if we will take that Explication, which the Homily it ſelf gives of them, it will evidently appear, that there was no ſuch thing intended by them: I ſhall produce theſe expreſſions in their proper places, and in the management of this Argument, ſhall

Firſt explain the ſenſe of our Church concerning the Doctrine of Juſtification, out of the Homilies of *Salvation*, *Faith*, *Good Works*, and *Repentance*. And

Secondly,

Secondly, Show you how the ſtate of the Controverſie is altered at this day, and what a juſt reaſon this is for a more particular explication of thoſe Expreſſions, which occaſioned the corruption of the wholſom Doctrine of our Church.

First I ſhall enquire what is the true ſenſe of the Church of *England* concerning the Doctrine of Juſtification.

And firſt, I obſerve, that our Church places the nature and eſſence of Juſtification in the *forgiveneſs of ſins*. This is evident from the very firſt words of the Homily: *Becauſe all men be Sinners, and Offenders againſt God, and Breakers of his Law & Commandments, therefore can no man by his own Acts, Words, and Deeds, (ſeem they never ſo good) be juſtified, and made righteous before God: but every man of neceſſity is conſtrained to ſeek for another Righteouſneſs or Juſtification, to be received at Gods own hands, that is to ſay, the forgiveneſs of his ſins and treſpaſſes, in ſuch things as he hath offended: And this Juſtification or Righteouſneſs* (the forgiveneſs of ſins) *which we ſo receive of Gods Mercy, and Chriſts Merits, embraced by Faith, is taken, accepted, and allowed of God, for our perfect and full Juſtification.* So that our full and perfect Juſtification conſiſts in the forgiveneſs of our ſins, whereby God over-looking what we have

done amiſs, deals with us, as with Righteous Perſons, that is beſtows Eternal Life on us.

The Homily takes notice of two ways of Juſtification:

The firſt is by our own Works; when we live ſo innocently and vertuouſly as to be acquitted and abſolved by God, according to the ſtrict Rules of Law and Juſtice: But in this way no Sinner can be juſtified; for the Law juſtifies no man, who is a Tranſgreſſor of the Law: and therefore ſince we are all Sinners, and can neither expiate our paſt ſins, nor perfectly keep the Law for the future, it is impoſſible that we ſhould be juſtified by our own Acts and Deeds.

It remains therefore, that no Sinner can be juſtified, or accounted Juſt and Righteous before God, without the pardon and forgiveneſs of his Sins: this is the Juſtification and Righteouſneſs of a Sinner, that God forgives his wilful ſins, and covers all the defects of his good Actions; for when the ſin is pardoned and covered, the man is innocent and righteous.

Now this Account, I am ſure, cannot pleaſe Dr. *Owen* and his Friends, who look upon the forgiveneſs of ſin but as one part of our Juſtification, and that the moſt inconſiderable

confiderable too, which only makes us innocent, and delivers us from the condemnation of the Law, but cannot entitle us to future Happineſs; beſides Innocency (as they tell us) there is required a perfect Righteouſneſs, the firſt is owing to the Death of Chriſt, which expiates our ſins, the ſecond to the Imputation of Chriſts perfect Righteouſneſs to us, which makes us perfectly juſt and righteous: this is a down-right contradiction to the Doctrine of our Church, which teaches us, that God accepts and allows of this forgiveneſs of ſin for our *full and perfect Juſtification.* Commun. P. 193.

And indeed, forgiveneſs of ſins is a true *Evangelical way* of Juſtification, in oppoſition to a *Legal* Juſtification, which conſiſts in perfect and unſinning Obedience: the firſt our Church requires, but the Doctor and his Friends exact the latter, a perfect Righteouſneſs of Works: for as the Doctor obſerves, *Life is not to be obtained, unleſs all be done that the Law requires; that is ſtill true, if thou wilt enter into life, keep the Commandments: they muſt be kept by us, or by our Surety*: All the difference the Doctor knows between the Law and the Goſpel, is only this, that the Law required a perfect Righteouſneſs from every man in his Knowledg of Chriſt, P. 314. Edit. 2. p. 220.

own Perſon, the Goſpel accepts of a perfect Righteouſneſs in the Perſon of our Mediator; but ſtill we are juſtified by a Legal, not Evangelical Righteouſneſs; that is, by a Righteouſneſs of Works, not by pardon and forgiveneſs.

And it has been before obſerved by ſome learned men, that to place our Juſtification in the forgiveneſs of our ſins, as our Church doth, and in the Imputation of Chriſts Perſonal Righteouſneſs to us, as others do, are not very conſiſtent. For by the Imputation of Chriſts Righteouſneſs to us, we are Legally Righteous, or have a perfect Righteouſneſs of Works; and Forgiveneſs of ſins, and a perfect Righteouſneſs, deſtroy each other: for if we are perfectly Righteous, whether in our own Perſons, or by Imputation, we need no Forgiveneſs; and if we need Forgiveneſs, it is plain that God does not ſo much as impute a perfect Righteouſneſs to us. So that when our Church places the whole nature of our Juſtification in the Forgiveneſs of ſins, it is a good Argument that ſhe never thought of a Legal Righteouſneſs of Works, of the Imputation of Chriſts perfect Righteouſneſs and Obedience, to make us righteous before God.

But

But for a fuller Explication of this Doctrine of Juſtification, we are taught in that Homily, that there are *eſpecially three things which muſt go together in our Juſtification: upon Gods part, his great Mercy and Grace; upon Chriſts part, Juſtice, that is, the Satisfaction of Gods Juſtice, or the price of our Redemption by the offering of his Body, and ſheddidg his Blood, with fulfilling of the Law perfectly and throughly; and upon our part, true and lively Faith in the Merits of Jeſus Chriſt, which yet is not ours, but by Gods working in us.* This is a much more intelligible way of explaining the Doctrine of Juſtification, than by the Material, Formal, Efficient, Inſtrumental Cauſes, and ſuch-like terms of Art, which need more explication than the Doctrine it ſelf; and therefore I ſhall follow this method, and reduce the Doctrine of the Homilies under theſe three Heads: What is Gods part, what is Chriſts part, and what is required on Mans part in the buſineſs of Juſtification.

Firſt, Let us conſider what is Gods part in the Juſtification of a Sinner; and that is, the Mercy and Grace of God, which expreſſes it ſelf firſt in providing a Ranſom for us, as it is expreſſed in the Homily, *That our Juſtification doth come freely by*

*the meer Mercy of God, and of ſo great and free mercy, that whereas all the World was not able of themſelves to pay any part towards their Ranſom, it pleaſed our heavenly Father of his infinite mercy, without any our Defert or Deſerving, to prepare for us the moſt precious Jewels of Chriſts Body and Blood, whereby our Ranſome might be fully paid, the Law fulfilled, and his Juſtice ſatisfied.* There is no Controverſie between us about this matter, that it was an expreſſion of the undeſerved Goodneſs of God, to ſend Chriſt into the World to ſave Sinners.

And ſecondly, The Mercy of God is ſeen in the very Act of Juſtifying us, in accepting this Atonement, and in forgiving our ſins. Thus we are informed in the ſecond part of that *Sermon of Salvation*. "Juſtification is not the Office of Man, "but of God: for Man cannot make him-"ſelf righteous by his own Works, nei-"ther in part, nor in the whole, for that "were the greateſt arrogancy and preſum-"ption of Man, that Antichriſt could ſet "up againſt God, to affirm, that a man "might by his own Works take away and "purge his own Sins, and ſo Juſtifie him-"ſelf. But Juſtification is the Office of "God only, and is not a thing which we "render to him, but which we receive of "him;

"him; not which we give to him, but "which we take of him, by his free Mer- "cy, and by the only Merits of his moſt "dearly beloved Son, our only Redeemer, "Saviour, and Juſtifier, Jeſus Chriſt. By which words, it is very plain, what is underſtood by Juſtification being Gods Act, and not Mans; that is, that it is an Act of Favour and Grace, not of Merit and Deſert.

Though God may be ſaid to Juſtifie an Innocent Man, when he pronounces him Juſt and Righteous according to Law, which is the proper office of a Judge, *i.e.* to acquit an Innocent Man, when he is arraigned; yet in this caſe an Innocent Man may be ſaid to Juſtifie himſelf, becauſe he is Juſtified by his own Actions, and God only like a Juſt and Righteous Judge, pronounces the Sentence of Juſtification, that is, acquits and abſolves him, as his actions deſerve, which ſtrict Juſtice requires: But in the Juſtification of a Sinner, who dares not ſtand the trial of ſtrict Juſtice, but appeals to the Grace and Mercy of God, Juſtification is properly Gods Act, and not Mans, is owing to the Divine Grace and Mercy, not to Mans Merit and Deſert.

Upon the ſame account, we are told in the ſame place, that *not our own Act to believe in Chriſt, or that this our Faith in Chriſt which is within us, doth not juſtifie us, (for that were to count our ſelves to be juſtified by ſome Act or Vertue that is within our ſelves.)* Which I confeſs ſounds very like what ſome men ſay, That Faith doth not juſtifie us, as our own Act, but as it apprehends the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, and applies it to us, by which Righteouſneſs thus apprehended by Faith we are juſtified; but there is nothing leſs meant in this place, as will appear from conſidering the whole Sentence, which is this: "So that the true "underſtanding of this Doctrine, We be "juſtified freely by Faith without Works, "or that we be juſtified by Faith in Chriſt "only, is not, that this our own Act to "believe in Chriſt, or this our Faith in "Chriſt, which is within us, doth juſtifie "us, and deſerve our Juſtification unto us, "(for that were to count our ſelves to be "juſtified by ſome Act or Vertue that is "within our ſelves) but the true under-"ſtanding and meaning thereof is, that "although we hear Gods Word, and be-"lieve it, and do never ſo many Works "thereunto, yet we muſt renounce the "Merit of all our ſaid Vertues, of Faith,

"Hope,

" Hope, Charity, and all other Vertues
" and good Deeds, which we have done,
" ſhall do, or can do, as things that be far
" too weak, and inſufficient, and imperfect,
" to deſerve Remiſſion of our Sins, and
" our Juſtification, and therefore we muſt
" truſt only in Gods Mercy, and that Sa-
" crifice which our High Prieſt and Savi-
" our Chriſt Jeſus the Son of God, once
" offered for us upon the Croſs, to obtain
" thereby Gods Grace and Remiſſion, as
" well of Original Sin in Baptiſm, as of
" all Actual Sin committed by us after Ba-
" ptiſm, if we truly repent, and turn un-
" feignedly to him again. The meaning of which is plain, that we are not juſtified by Faith as our own act, as we are not juſtified by Hope and Charity, as our own acts, that is, that they cannot merit our Juſtification, or the Forgiveneſs of our ſins: When we have done the beſt we can, we muſt ſtill fly to the Mercy of God, through the Merits of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt: that diſtinction of Faiths juſtifying, not as our own Act, but as it apprehends the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, and cloaths us with the perfect Robes of his Righteouſneſs, for which God accounts us perfectly Righteous, is of a later date than theſe Homilies, and very inconſiſtent with the Doctrine

ſtrine contained in them. Thus you ſee what Gods part is in the Juſtification of a Sinner, *viz.* To provide a Ranſom, and to forgive ſins in vertue of that Ranſom; that is to juſtifie thoſe who according to the ſtrictneſs and rigor of the Law, are not Juſt and Righteous Perſons. Thus to conclude this in the words of the Homily, *You have heard the Office of God in our Juſtification, and how we receive it of him freely by his Mercy, without our Deſerts.*

*Sermon of Salvation,* part 3.

Let us now conſider what is Chriſts part in our Juſtification, and that is expreſſed by *Juſtice, that is, the ſatisfaction of Juſtice, or the Price of our Redemption, by the offering of his Body, and ſhedding of his Blood, with fulfilling of the Law perfectly and throughly:* The plain meaning of which is, that we are juſtified for the ſake of Chriſts Merits, that his Obedience in doing and ſuffering the Will of God, in dying for our ſins, and in fulfilling the Law, is the meritorious cauſe of our Juſtification: that is, did deſerve at Gods hands, that for Chriſts ſake he ſhould pardon all humble, penitent and believing Sinners. This is all the Imputation of Chriſts Righteouſneſs which our Church acknowledges, that the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is the meritorious Cauſe of our Juſtification.

Thus

Thus we are told, "That Infants be-
"ing baptized, and dying in their Infan- Sermon of
"cy, are by this Sacrifice waſhed from Salvation,
"their ſins, brought to Gods favour, and part 1.
"made his Children, and Inheritors of his
"Kingdom of Heaven: And they which
"in act or deed do ſin after their Baptiſm,
"when they turn again to God unfeign-
"edly, they are likewiſe waſhed by this
"Sacrifice from their ſins, in ſuch ſort
"that there remaineth not any ſpot of ſin,
"that ſhall be imputed to their damna-
"tion: Which is to the ſame ſenſe with that of St. *John*, that *if we walk in the light, as he is in the light*, (if we are holy as God is) *we have fellowſhip one with another, and the Blood of Jeſus Chriſt his Son cleanſeth us from all ſin*, 1 *John* i. 7. And to this ſenſe our Church expounds thoſe Texts, *Rom.* iii. *All have offended, and have need of the Glory of God, but are juſtified freely by his Grace, by Redemption which is in Jeſus Chriſt, whom God hath ſet forth to us for a Reconciler and Peace-maker, through faith in his Blood, to ſhew his Righteouſneſs*: And in the Tenth Chapter, *Chriſt is the end of the Law unto Righteouſneſs, to every man that believeth*: And in the Eighth Chapter, *That which was impoſſible by the Law, in as much as it was weak by the fleſh, God ſending his own Son in the ſimilitude*

of

*of ſinful fleſh, by ſin damned ſin in the fleſh, that the Righteouſneſs of the Law might be fulfilled in us, which walk not after the fleſh, but after the Spirit*: Which Texts are alledged by our Modern Divines, to prove the Imputation of Chriſts Righteouſneſs to us, as the formal cauſe of our Juſtification; but our Church expreſly tells us, that ſhe underſtands theſe Texts to ſignifie no more on Chriſts part, *but Juſtice, or the Satisfaction of Gods Juſtice.* And whereas theſe new Divines make ſuch a difference between the Active and Paſſive Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, that by his Death and Sufferings he expiated our Sins, and by his Active Obedience makes us righteous: Our Church knows no difference in this matter, but aſſures us, that they both concur to the ſame effect, to make ſatisfaction for our ſins; *He made ſatisfaction to Gods Juſtice, by the offering of his Body, and ſhedding his Blood, with fulfilling the Law perfectly and throughly.* Which account I expreſly gave of it in my former Diſcourſe, p. 330. & Edit. 2. p. 231. In this ſenſe we are taught, *that Chriſt is now the Righteouſneſs of all them that truly believe in him; he for them paid their Ranſom by his Death, he for them fulfilled the Law in his Life; So that now in him and by him every true Chriſtian Man may be called a fulfiller of*

*the*

*the Law: forasmuch as that which their infirmity lacked, Christs Justice hath supplied.* Which last clause the *Looking-Glass-Maker* thought fit to leave out, for he had so much wit in his anger, as to see, that it did not make to his purpose: for the meaning of it is this, that Christs active and passive Righteousness is imputed to us, to procure the pardon of our sins, & thereby to supply the defects of our Righteousness, not to make us formally righteous: though our Righteousness be imperfect and defective, yet Christ by his Righteousness having obtained the pardon of our sins, we may be said in him to fulfil the Law, in as much, *as that which our Infirmity lacked, Christs Justice* (his Merit and Satisfaction, as it is before explained) *hath supplied.* And once for all, our Church tells us, what she means by being justified by Christ only: *We put our Faith in Christ, that we be justified by him only, that we be justified by Gods Mercy, and the Merits of our Saviour Christ only, and by no vertue and good works of our own, that is in us, or that we can be able to have or to do, to deserve the same: Christ himself being the only cause meritorious thereof.* So that the plain sense of our Church is, that Christs part in our Justification is only to be the *meritorious cause of it*, to merit Pardon and Justification

Serm. of Salvation part 3.

tion for all thoſe, who heartily believe in him. And who-ever of our Communion have affirmed any more, they have in ſo doing plainly deſerted the Doctrine of our Church: And therefore Doctor *Prideaux* himſelf does expreſly diſown the Imputation of the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt in any other ſenſe than that of Merit: *Juſtificamur per juſtitiam Chriſti (non perſonæ, quâ ipſe veſtitus eſt, ſed meriti, quâ ſuos veſtit) nobis imputatam*: that is, "We are juſtified by "the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt imputed to "us, not by his Perſonal Righteouſneſs "(as Dr. *Owen* affirms) with which he is "cloathed himſelf, but with the Righte-"ouſneſs of Merit, with which he cloaths "thoſe who belong to him. And in anſwer to a paſſage out of *Bellarmine*, he adds, *Quis unquam è noſtris, nos per juſtitiam Chriſti imputatam, formaliter juſtificari aſſeruit*: that is, "Who among us ever affirmed, that "we were formally juſtified by the impu-"ted Righteouſneſs of Chriſt. And as the learned *Forbs* obſerves, it ſounds very like a contradiction to aſſert, that the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is both the meritorious and the formal cauſe of our Juſtification. *Nequit enim fieri, ut eadem res ſimul ſit cauſa efficiens, ad quam meritum reducitur, & formalis ejuſdem effecti, quia ſit ſimul & de eſſentia*

Lect. 5. de Juſtificatione.

Conſiderationes modeſtæ, p. 52.

*essentia effecti foret, & non foret, cùm causa formalis interna sit, & πρὸς ἓν, efficiens autem externa tantum, ut constat:* that is, "It "cannot be, that the same thing should "be both the efficient (as Merit is) and "the formal cause of the same effect; for "so it must both be of the essence and not "of the essence of the effect; for a formal "cause is internal, and belongs to the na-"ture and essence of the thing, but an ef-"ficient is an external cause, as every one "knows: And therefore when the Learn-ed Bishop *Davenant*, asserts the Righte-ousness of Christ imputed to us, to be the formal cause of our Justification, and ex-plains it by our being justified *ex intuitu meritorum Christi, & propter Christum*, with re-spect to the Merits of Christ, and for Christs sake, though he uses a different phrase, which too many since have abused to bad purposes; yet he seems to mean no more by it, than we do, who say, that the Righteousness of Christ is the meritorious cause of our Justification, for that must be explained by the same phrases of being justified for Christs sake, and with respect to the Merits of Christ: and indeed the only difference the Bishop makes between the Righteousness of Christ being the me-ritorious and the formal cause of our Justi-fication

De Justitia habituali & actuali.

P. 16. fication is no more but this, that in the first case he considers the Merits of Christ absolutely, as the price of our Redemption; in the second he considers those same Merits of Christ applied to particular persons for the pardon of their particular sins, which still makes it no more than a meritorious cause. His words are these: *Eadem & unica justitia Christi in se & suo valore considerata est meritoria causa humanæ justificationis, considerata autem quatenus imputatur, donatur, applicatur, tanquam sua singulis credentibus, & in Christum insitis, subit vicem causæ formalis.* And that he intends no more by a formal cause, than what others express by a meritorious cause, is plain in this, that he acknowledges the imputation even of Christs active Righteousness only in the sense of Merit. He expresses his agreement with *Vasques* in this matter, who acknowledges the imputation of the Merit of Christs active Obedience: *Cùm dicimus Merita Christi nobis imputari, idem de justitia & sanctitate illius existimamus; nam cùm Merita Christi ex sanctitate ejus dignitatem accipiant, eodem sensu quo Merita nobis dicuntur imputari, ipsa etiam Justitia Christi imputari dicitur:* that is, "When we say, "that the Merits of Christ are imputed to "us, we understand the same thing of his "Holi-

"Holineſs and active Righteouſneſs: for "ſince his Purity and Holineſs gave worth "and dignity to his Merits, in the ſame "ſenſe, wherein his Merits are ſaid to be "imputed to us, his active Righteouſneſs "and Obedience is imputed alſo. So that the Biſhop never thought that the Obedience and Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is ſo made ours, that we are accounted by God to have done the ſame things, to have performed all that Righteouſneſs which Chriſt performed, which is the modern notion of Imputation; but it is ſo imputed to us, that upon account of the Merits of Chriſts Life and Death, God forgives the Sins, and accepts the Perſons of thoſe who heartily believe in him, as the ſame Learned and Reverend Perſon excellently explains it ſoon after: Where he tells us, that we are delivered from the Law by Faith in Chriſt; *whoſoever believes in him ſhall not periſh, and ſhall not come into condemnation*, or *into Judgment*; as he reads it, *John* v. 24. and adds, *what Judgment is this, from which Believers are delivered by Chriſt? Proculdubio ſtrictum illud, ubi juxta normam legis aliquis examinatur, & prout deprehenditur huic normæ reſpondere juſtus aut injuſtus pronunciatur, &c.* "No doubt that ſtrict Judg"ment, where men are examined accor-

"ding to the Rule of the Law, and are "pronounced juſt or unjuſt, as they are "found to agree with that Rule: *Juſtificatio igitur & ſalus credentium non ex eo dependet, quod habent in ſe qualitatem novæ juſtitiæ, quam audent legali examini & ſtricto Dei judicio ſubjicere, ſed quod per & propter Merita Redemptoris, non ſubituri ſunt tale judicium, ſed perinde cum illis agetur, ac ſi haberent in ſeipſis exactam juſtitiam legalem*: "Therefore the "Juſtification and Salvation of Believers "does not depend on this, that they have "ſuch an internal Righteouſneſs as they "dare ſubmit to a legal Tryal, and to the "ſtrict and rigorous Judgment of God, "but that by and for the Merits of their "Redeemer, they ſhall never undergo ſuch "a Judgment, but ſhall be dealt with as "if they had an exact legal Righteouſneſs "of their own. And this he tells us he means by the Merits of Chriſt being the formal cauſe of our Juſtification; and in this ſenſe I heartily own it, though the abuſe of that Phraſe is a ſufficient Reaſon to alter it.

Let us now conſider in the third place, what is required on our part, in order to our Juſtification by Gods Mercy, and by Chriſts Merits, and that is plainly expreſſed in the Homily: *And upon our part, true*

*true and lively Faith in the Merits of Jesus Christ, which yet is not ours, but by Gods working in us.*

That we may the better understand this, we must enquire, What is meant by this Faith in the *Merits of Christ*? And what is meant by a *true and lively Faith in Christs Merits*? And what our Church attributes to this Faith in the Work of Justification?

First, What is meant by *Faith in the Merits of Christ*?

Now the general Notion of Faith is, that it is *a perswasion and belief in mans heart, whereby he knoweth that there is a God, and agreeth unto all Truth of Gods most holy Word, contained in the holy Scripture*: This is such a Faith as Devils and wicked Men may have: But then a Faith in Christs Merits, or a true justifying Faith, such as no wicked men can have, is "not only the common "belief of the Articles of Faith, but it is "also a true trust and confidence of the "Mercy of God, through our Lord Jesus "Christ, and a stedfast hope of all good "things to be received at Gods hand: and "that although we through infirmity or "temptation of our ghostly Enemy, do "fall from him by sin, yet if we return "again to him by true Repentance, that

Homily of Faith, part 1.

"he will forgive and forget our offences "for his Sons ſake, our Saviour Jeſus "Chriſt, and will make us Inheritors with "him of his everlaſting Kingdom; and "that in the mean time, till that King-"dom come, he will be our Protector and "Defender in all perils and dangers, "whatſoever do chance: and that though "ſometimes he doth ſend us ſharp adver-"ſity yet that evermore he will be a lo-"ving Father unto us, if we truſt in him, "and commit our ſelves wholly unto him, "hang only upon him, and call upon him, "ready to obey and ſerve him. That is, a Faith in the Merits of Chriſt, is a ſure Hope and Confidence in God, a certain Expectation of all temporal and ſpiritual good things from God, for the Merits of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, upon the condition of Repentance, and a new Life: or as it is excellently expreſſed a little after in the ſame Homily: "For the "very ſure and lively Chriſtian Faith is, "not only to believe all things of God, "contained in holy Scripture, but alſo is "an earneſt truſt and confidence in God, "that he doth regard us, and that he is "careful over us, as the Father is over the "Child whom he doth love, and that he "will be merciful to us for his only Sons

"ſake,

"ſake, and that we have our Saviour "Chriſt our perpetual Advocate and "Prieſt, in whoſe only Merits, Oblation, "and Suffering, we do truſt that our Of- "fences be continually waſhed and pur- "ged, whenſoever we (repenting truly) "do return to him with our whole heart, "ſtedfaſtly determining with our ſelves, "through his Grace, to obey and ſerve "him in keeping his Commandments, and "never to turn back again to ſin.

So that Juſtifying Faith (according to the ſenſe of our Church) is not a perſwaſion that our ſins are actually pardoned, or that God for Chriſts ſake will forgive our ſins, without requiring any more of us, than to believe, that he will forgive them. But it is a firm perſwaſion that God will forgive our ſins for Chriſts ſake, if we repent of our ſins, and forſake them, and determine through his gracious aſſiſtance never to return to them again.

But we ſhall underſtand this the better, if we conſider, ſecondly, what is meant by a *true lively* Faith in Chriſts Merits: for our Church diſtinguiſhes between a dead and a lively Faith: *A dead Faith is by the holy Apoſtle St.* James *compared to the faith of Devils, which believe God to be true and juſt, and tremble for fear, yet they do nothing well,* Homily of Faith, part 1.

*but all evil. And such a manner of Faith have the wicked and naughty Christian People, which confess God (as* St. Paul *saith) in their mouth, but deny him in their deeds, being abominable, and without the right faith, and to all good works reprovable.* —— And, *Forasmuch as Faith without works is dead, it is not now Faith, as a dead Man is not a Man: This dead Faith therefore is not the sure and substantial Faith, which saveth Sinners.*

Let us now consider what a *lively* Faith is; and the description of that follows in these words: *Another Faith there is in Scripture, which is not (as the foresaid Faith) idle, unfruitful, and dead, but worketh by Charity (as* St. Paul *declareth,* Gal. v.) *which as the other vain Faith is called a dead Faith, so this may be called a quick or lively Faith.* —— *This is the true, lively, and unfeigned Christian Faith, and is not in the mouth and outward Profession only, but it liveth and stirreth inwardly in the heart. And this Faith is not without hope and trust in God, nor without the love of God and of our Neighbours, nor without the fear of God, nor without the desire to hear Gods Word, and to follow the same in eschewing evil, and doing gladly all good works.* Heb. 12. *This Faith (as* St. Paul *describes it) is the sure ground and foundation of the benefits which we ought to look for, and trust to receive of God, a certificate and sure looking for them,*

*them, although they yet ſenſibly appear not unto us, &c.* This I think is as plain, as words can make it, that the only Foundation of our Hope and Truſt in God, and of our expectation of all temporal and ſpiritual good things from him, is a lively and working Faith; and upon theſe terms I will diſpute with no man; I never aſſerted more my ſelf, nor deſire any other man ſhould.

But to make it more evident what the ſenſe of our Church is, concerning the neceſſity of Good Works, we are taught in theſe Homilies three things concerning Faith:

Firſt, That it is eſſential to true Faith to be fruitful in good Works, when it hath the Opportunities of Action: *This Faith doth not lie dead in the heart, but is lively and fruitful in bringing forth good Works: That as the Light cannot be hid, but will ſhew forth it ſelf at one place or other; ſo a true Faith cannot be kept ſecret, but when occaſion is offered it will break out, and ſhew it ſelf by Good Works. And as the living Body of a Man ever exerciſeth ſuch things as belong to a natural and living Body, for nouriſhment and preſervation of the ſame, as it hath need, opportunity, and occaſion: even ſo the Soul that hath a lively Faith in it, will be doing always ſome good Work, which ſhall declare* Ibid.

*that it is living, and will not be unoccupied. Therefore when men hear in the Scriptures ſo high commendation of Faith, that it maketh us to pleaſe God, to live with God, and to be the Children of God. If then they phantaſie that they be ſet at liberty from doing all good works, and may live as they luſt, they trifle with God, and deceive themſelves; and it is a manifeſt token that they be far from having the true lively Faith, & alſo far from knowledge what true Faith meaneth.* And then follows that excellent Deſcription of Faith, which I have tranſcribed above. P. 76.

From this it is very plain, that our Church accounts a holy Life as eſſential to a true Faith, as Action is to Life: and that true Faith is diſcovered by a holy Life, juſt as an inward Principle of Life is diſcovered by external and viſible Actions.

This is farther proved in the Homily, from the examples of all good men in former Ages, whoſe Faith was fruitful in good Works, ſuch as *Abel, Noah, Abraham, Iſaac, Jacob, &c.* and from the Teſtimony of the holy Scripture, eſpecially of the 1 *Epiſt.* of S. *John*, where there are ſo many expreſs teſtimonies to this Truth: and by refuting the ſeveral pretences of thoſe men, who fancy that they believe in God, and love him,

Sermon of Faith, part 2.

him, though they either live in ſin, or neglect to obey his Laws: & the concluſion of all is in theſe words, *So they that be Chriſtians, and have received the knowledge of God, and of Chriſts Merits, and yet of a ſet purpoſe do live idly, without good works, thinking the name of a naked faith to be either ſufficient for them, or elſe ſetting their minds upon vain pleaſures of this World, do live in ſin, without repentance, not uttering the Fruits that do belong to ſuch an high Profeſſion, upon ſuch preſumptuous Perſons, and wilful Sinners, muſt needs remain the great vengeance of God, and eternal puniſhment in Hell, prepared for the unjuſt and wicked Livers.* Part 3.

The ſecond thing which we are taught of Faith, is, That Faith is the only Principle of Good Works, acceptable and pleaſing to God; *that without it can no good Work be done, accepted and pleaſant unto God: for as a Branch cannot bear Fruit of it ſelf (ſaith our Saviour Chriſt) except it abide in the Vine, ſo cannot you, except you abide in me.——And without Faith it is impoſſible to pleaſe God.——And whatever work is done without Faith is ſin. Faith giveth life to the Soul, and they be as much dead to God, who lack Faith, as they be to the World, whoſe Bodies lack Souls.* This is a true account why no Works, though they may appear never ſo good, can be accepta- Sermon of Good Works, part 1.

ble

ble to God without Faith, becauſe Faith is the only Principle of a new and ſpiritual Life, which makes us alive to God, which gives us ſuch a ſenſe of God, and reverence for his Authority, as makes us careful in all things to pleaſe him, which is the very life and ſoul of Religion, and all Vertue; and as it is obſerved in that Homily from St. *Chryſoſtom*: *As men that be very men indeed, firſt have life, and after be nouriſhed, ſo muſt our Faith in Chriſt go before, and after be nouriſhed with good Works: A Life may be without Nouriſhment*, (that is, for ſome ſhort time) *but Nouriſhment cannot be without Life: A man muſt needs be nouriſhed by good Works, but firſt he muſt have Faith: He that doth good Deeds, yet without Faith, he hath no Life.*

Much to the ſame purpoſe it is obſerved from St. *Auguſtine*, That *the intent maketh the Works good, but Faith muſt guide and order the intent of Man.----- So that he which doth not his good Works with a godly intent, & a true Faith, that worketh by Love, the whole Body beſides, (that is to ſay) all the whole number of his Works is dark, and hath no light in them: for good Deeds be not meaſured by the facts themſelves, and ſo diſcerned from Vices, but by the ends and intents for which they were done.*

The

The meaning then of our Church is no more, but this, That whereas without Faith no man can love and reverence God, or design to please him in all things, whatever materially Good Works such men may do, yet they are not properly Acts of Religion, as not being referred to God, and therefore cannot be acceptable to God, as such, nor avail any man to eternal Life.

Upon this account it is, that God so much prizes Faith, because it is the Seed and Principle of Universal Obedience: that when there is such a sincere Principle in us, and wants an opportunity of exerting it self, it is accepted by God without Works; as is observed in the same place from St. *Chrysostom: I can shew a man that by Faith without Works lived and came to Heaven, but without Faith never any man had Life: the Thief that was hanged when Christ suffered, did believe only, and the most merciful God justified him*: (though, as Bishop *Davenant* observes, his Faith produced a great many good Works in a very short time) but then it follows; *If he had lived, and not regarded Faith, and the works thereof, he should have lost his Salvation again; but this is the effect, that I say, that Faith by it self saved him, but Works by themselves never justified*

any

*any man*: Where he prefers Faith above Works, becauſe Faith being a Univerſal Principle of Obedience, is accepted by God without Works, when there wants time or opportunity to act them, though in no other caſe; but no Works can be pleaſing and acceptable to God, unleſs they proceed from a true and hearty Faith: *Neither Faith is without Works, having opportunity thereto, nor Works can avail to everlaſting Life without Faith.*

The third thing noted of Faith, is, What manner of Good Works Faith produces; and the Good Works of Faith are not ſome external Acts of Hypocriſie, or ſome worthleſs and flattering Devotions, not ſome Arbitrary Superſtitions, *&c.* but are the ſubſtantial Duties of Religion, which conſiſt in the love of God, and of Men, which make us like to God, and uſeful to the World, as is excellently diſcourſed in the Second and Third parts of the Homily of Good Works.

So that according to the ſenſe of our Church, Juſtifying Faith is not an idle and unactive Principle, but is fruitful in Good Works, and no other Faith can juſtifie us, but ſuch a lively Faith as abounds in all the Fruits of Righteouſneſs, according as it hath occaſion and opportunity of doing good.

But

But to make this ſtill more evident, I obſerve farther, that whereas our Church ſeems to lay the greateſt ſtreſs upon one particular Act of Faith in the matter of Juſtification, *viz.* our truſt in the Mercy of God, and our apprehending the Promiſe of Forgiveneſs through the Merits of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, ſhe alſo makes a good Life, or at leaſt a firm and ſtedfaſt Reſolution of a good Life, antecedently neceſſary to this Juſtifying Act of Faith, or to our Truſt and Affiance in the Mercy of God, through the Merits of our Lord and Saviour: This is evident from that Reaſon, which is aſſigned, why no wicked men can have a ſure Truſt and Confidence in Gods Mercy: *For how can any man have this true Faith, this ſure confidence in God, that by the Merits of Chriſt his ſins be forgiven, and he reconciled to the favour of God, and to be partaker of the Kingdom of Heaven by Chriſt; when he liveth ungodly, and denieth Chriſt in his Deeds? Surely no ſuch ungodly man can have this Faith and truſt in God. For as they know Chriſt to be the only Saviour of the World, ſo they know alſo that wicked men ſhall not enjoy the Kingdom of God: They know that God hateth Unrighteouſneſs, that he will deſtroy all thoſe that ſpeak unruly, that thoſe who have done good Works (which cannot be done without a live-*

Serm. of Salvation part 3.

ly

*by Faith in Christ) shall come forth unto the Resurrection of Life, and those that have done evil, shall come unto the Resurrection of Judgment: Very well they know also, that to them that be contentious, and to them that will not be obedient unto the Truth, but will obey Unrighteousness, shall come indignation, wrath, and affliction, &c.*

The plain meaning of which words is this, that no wicked man can have a true Faith in Gods Mercy, because the Promise of forgiveness is made upon the Conditions of Repentance and a New Life; whereas God hath threatned eternal damnation against all wicked Livers; and therefore for any man, while he lives in wickedness, to hope to be pardoned by God for Christs sake, is an express contradiction to the Promises and Threatnings of the Gospel, and surely no man shall be justified for believing a lie.

Thus in the first part of the Sermon of Faith, the design of which is to prove, that a true, lively, justifying Faith is fruitful in Good Works, we are expresly taught, "That he that believeth that all "that is spoken of God in the Bible is "true, and yet liveth so ungodly, that he "cannot look to enjoy the Promises and "Benefits of God; although it may be

"said,

"ſaid, that ſuch a man hath a Faith and "Belief to the Words of God, yet it is "not properly ſaid, that he believeth in "God, or hath ſuch a Faith and Truſt in "God, whereby he may ſurely look for "Grace, Mercy, and everlaſting Life, at "Gods hands, but rather for indignation "and puniſhment, according to the merits "of his wicked Life.

This contains the very ſame Doctrine which was expreſſed in the former Paragraph, & farther gives us an account, what diſtinction our Church makes between *Credere Deo, & Credere in Deum*; to believe God and to believe in God: the firſt ſignifies to believe whatever is contained in the Word of God to be true, the ſecond is to yield ſuch Obedience to the Revelations of the Divine Will, as may encourage us to truſt in God for the Accompliſhment of all thoſe gracious Promiſes of Pardon and Eternal Life: This is all the fiducial Reliance which our Church teacheth, to truſt to the Mercy of God through the Merits of Chriſt, for Pardon and Eternal Life, upon our faithful diſcharge of all Goſpel-Obedience.

The ſame Doctrine is more expreſly taught, if it be poſſible, in the Second Part of the Sermon of Faith: "*Verily*,

"*verily*,

"*verily, I say unto you, He that believeth in*
"*me hath everlasting Life*: Now forasmuch
"as he that believeth in Christ hath ever-
"lasting Life, it must needs consequently
"follow, that he that hath this Faith
"must have also Good Works, and be stu-
"dious to observe Gods Commandments
"obediently: For to them that have evil
"Works, and lead their Life in Disobe-
"dience and Transgression, or breaking
"Gods Commandments, without Repen-
"tance, pertaineth not everlasting Life,
"but everlasting Death, as Christ himself
"saith, *They that do well shall go into Life*
"*eternal; but they that do evil, shall go into*
"*everlasting fire*, &c. What can be more
expressly said, to prove the inseparable
Union of Good Works with Faith, in the
Act of Justification?

In the Homily of Repentance this Do-
ctrine is so plainly taught, that there can
be no possible evasion: We are there told,
"That the true Preachers of the Gospel
"of the Kingdom of Heaven, and of the
"glad and joyful tidings of Salvation,
"have always in their godly Sermons and
"Preachings unto the People, joyned
"these two together, Repentance and
"Forgiveness of sins, even as our Saviour
"Jesus Christ did appoint himself, say-
"ing,

"ing, *So it behoved Chriſt to ſuffer, and to riſe*
"*again the third day, and that Repentance and*
"*Forgiveneſs of Sins ſhould be preached in his*
"*Name among all Nations.*

Forgiveneſs of ſins (as I obſerved before) is Evangelical Juſtification, and the neceſſary condition of Forgiveneſs is Repentance: This is proved in that Homily by many Scripture-Promiſes and Examples, and therefore we muſt conſider what our Church means by Repentance, and the explication of this is reduced to *four principal Points*: *From what we muſt return, to whom we muſt return, by whom we may be able to convert, and the manner how to turn to God.*

*Firſt, From whence, or from what things we muſt return*: and that is, "From all our "ſins, not only groſſer vices, but the fil-"thy luſts and inward concupiſcences "of the Fleſh. —— All theſe things muſt "they forſake, that will truly turn unto "the Lord, and repent aright. For ſith "for ſuch things the wrath of God com-"eth upon the Children of Diſobedience, "no end of puniſhment ought to be look'd "for, as long as we continue in ſuch things. "But this muſt be done by Faith: for ſith "that God is a Spirit, he can by no other "means be apprehended and taken hold

"upon. That is, God being a Spirit, we cannot ſee him with bodily Eyes, nor go to him on our Legs, nor take hold of him with an Arm of Fleſh, and therefore this Metaphor of returning to God, and going to him, and taking hold of him, muſt be expounded to a ſpiritual ſenſe, is the work of Faith, which diſcovers him who is inviſible, and unites our Souls and Spirits to him.

And, "We have need of a Mediator "for to bring and reconcile us unto him, "who for our ſins is angry with us; the "ſame is Jeſus Chriſt, who being true and "natural God, *&c. took our nature upon him*, "that ſo he might be a Mediator between "God and us, and pacifie his wrath.

In the ſecond part of the Homily, we have this general Deſcription of Repentance, That "it is a true Returning un-"to God, whereby men forſaking utter-"ly their Idolatry and Wickedneſs, do "with a lively Faith embrace, love, and "worſhip the true living GOD only, "and give themſelves to all manner of "good Works, which by Gods Word "they know to be acceptable unto him. And we are there informed, "That there "are four Parts of Repentance, the firſt "is Contrition of the Heart: For we

"muſt

" must be earneſtly ſorry for our ſins, and " unfeignedly lament and bewail, that we " have by them ſo grievouſly offended " our moſt bounteous and merciful God, " &c.

" The ſecond is an unfeigned Confeſ- " ſion and acknowledging of our ſins to " God.

" The third is Faith, whereby we " do apprehend and take hold upon the " Promiſes of God, touching the free " pardon and forgiveneſs of our ſins, " which Promiſes are ſealed up unto us, " with the death and blood-ſhedding of " the Lord Jeſus Chriſt. And the Rea- ſon of this, is, becauſe Contrition and Confeſſion will avail us nothing, unleſs we ſtedfaſtly believe, and be fully perſwa- ded, that God for his Son Jeſus Chriſts ſake, will forgive us all our ſins; for " though we be never ſo earneſtly ſorry for " our ſins, and acknowledge and confeſs " them, yet all theſe things ſhall be but " means to bring us to utter deſparation, " except we do ſtedfaſtly believe that God " our heavenly Father will for his Son Jeſus " Chriſts ſake pardon and forgive us our " Offences and Treſpaſſes, and utterly " put them out of remembrance in his " ſight: therefore they that teach Repen-

"tance without Christ, and a lively Faith "in the Mercy of God, do only teach "*Cains*, or *Judas* Repentance: That is, they teach men to be sorry for their sins, without any hopes of Pardon and Forgiveness, which is only to be obtained through our Lord Jesus Christ.

The fourth part of Repentance is "an "amendment of Life, in bringing forth "fruits worthy of Repentance: for they "that do truly repent, must be clean al-"ter'd and changed, they must become "New Creatures, they must be no more "the same that they were before: As appears from *John* the *Baptists* Exhortation to the Scribes and Pharisees, "whereby "we do learn, that if we will have the "wrath of God to be pacified, we must in "no wise dissemble, but turn unto him "again with a true and sound Repentance, "which may be known and declared by "good Fruits, as by most sure and infalli-"ble signs thereof.

This I think is as plain as words can make it, that Repentance, which consists in a hearty sorrow for all our sins, and in a humble Confession of them to Almighty God, and in a sincere Faith and Trust in the Mercies of God through our Lord Jesus Christ, together with an actual amend-

ment

ment of our lives, is according to the ſenſe of our Church abſolutely neceſſary to obtain *the pardon of our ſins*, that is, *Juſtification by the free Grace of God.*

This has often made me wonder, that any one ſhould affix ſuch a Doctrine as this to the Church of *England*, That *Repentance it ſelf is not antecedently neceſſary to our Juſtification*; I am ſure the Learned Biſhop *Davenant* was of another mind in this point, for he expreſly aſſerts, that there are ſome Works, *ſine quibus Juſtificatio nunquam fuit ab ullo mortalium obtenta, nunquam obtinebitur*, "without which Juſtification never was, "and never ſhall be obtained by any mor- "tal man;" among which he reckons "true Repentance and Faith, and the love "of God and of our Neighbour: *Hæc & hujuſmodi opera cordis interna ſunt omnibus juſtificatis neceſſaria, non quod contineant in ſe efficaciam ſeu meritum Juſtificationis, ſed quod juxta ordinationem divinam vel requiruntur, ut conditiones prævias ſeu concurrentes, ſicuti pœnitere & credere, vel ut effecta à fide juſtificante neceſſario manantia, ut amare Deum*, &c. *i.e.* Theſe "and ſuch-like internal Works of the "Heart are neceſſary to all that are juſti- "fied, not that they are meritorious Cau- "ſes of Juſtification, but becauſe accor- "ding to the Divine Appointment, they "are

De Juſtit. Habit. & act. cap. 29.

"are required either as previous or con-
"curring conditions, such as Repentance
"and Faith; or as effects, which neceſſa-
"rily flow from a juſtifying Faith, ſuch as
"to love God, *&c.* Where this Learned Prelate doth expreſly aſſert, that *Repentance*, as well as Faith, is a *previous Condition* of our Juſtification; and I fear will hereafter be accounted one of our Innovators.

And that diſtinction, which the Biſhop makes between thoſe Works which are required as previous Conditions of Juſtification, as to repent and believe; and thoſe Works which are neceſſary Effects of juſtifying Faith, which muſt always be preſent in the juſtified Perſon, as to love God, *&c.* gives a plain and eaſie anſwer to the grand Exception againſt the antecedent neceſſity of Repentance to our Juſtification: *viz.* Becauſe then it muſt precede Faith it ſelf, (I ſuppoſe becauſe every true Believer is actually juſtified in the firſt inſtant of his being a true Believer) whereas all good Works, (and therefore Repentance and Contrition, which are certainly good Works) are the Effects and Fruits of Faith, and ſo conſequently muſt follow our Juſtification by Faith, unleſs we will place the Effects before their Cauſe;

Cauſe: But this is abſolutely falſe, that all good Works are the effects and fruits of juſtifying Faith: for there are ſome good Works which are eſſential to juſtifying Faith, and it is not juſtifying Faith without them, ſuch as Repentance and Contrition, without which no Faith is a true juſtifying Faith; and therefore we may obſerve in our Homilies, that ſometimes Faith is made an eſſential part of Repentance, ſometimes Repentance is made eſſential to a juſtifying Faith, as appears from what I have diſcourſed above.

The reaſon of the miſtake is this, That theſe men do not diſtinguiſh between the general notion of Faith, and *Juſtifying Faith*; Faith in general, as it ſignifies a belief of the Being and Providence of God, and the Truth of the Scriptures, *&c.* is neceſſary to produce any good Actions, *for without Faith it is impoſſible to pleaſe God*; but this bare Aſſent of the Underſtanding is not juſtifying Faith, till it excite in us a hearty ſorrow for our ſins, and ſincere purpoſes of a New Life, and a great Truſt and Affiance in the Mercy of God, through our Lord Jeſus Chriſt: So that Repentance, and the Purpoſe of a New Life, are at leaſt eſſential to juſtify-

ing Faith, and not the fruits and effects of it; but the actual performance of these Vows and Promises, and the faithful discharge of our Duty to God and Men in a holy and blameless Life, may be called the effects of justifying Faith, not that they are not as necessary to a justifying Faith as Repentance is, but because our Justification is begun without them, (God in infinite Grace and Mercy receiving us into favour upon our first return to him) though these good Works must necessarily follow, to compleat and perfect our Justification, as it is expresly observed from St. *Chrysostom* in the Homily of Good Works, concerning the Thief upon the Cross, that *if he had lived and not regarded Faith, and the Works thereof, he should have lost his Salvation again.* And in this sense we are told in the Homily of Salvation, That *Faith doth not shut out the justice of our Good Works, necessarily to be done afterwards,* (that is after our Justification) *of Duty towards God.* And upon the same account our Church in her XII Article teaches us. **That Good Works are the Fruits of Faith, and follow those who are Justified.**

And this gives an easie and plain account of the XIII Article of our Church, which

which rejects those Works which are done before Justification, that is, before a *Justifying Faith*, as is plain from the Article: **Works done before the Grace of Christ, and the Inspiration of his Spirit, are not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of Faith in Jesus Christ; neither do they make men meet to receive Grace or (as the School-Authors say) deserve Grace of Congruity, yea rather, for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but that they have the nature of Sin.** The plain meaning of which is this, That Works done before Justifying Faith are not pleasing to God; that is, whatever Works we do before we repent of our sins, and purpose to live a New Life, and trust in the Mercy of God, and Merits of our Saviour for Pardon and Acceptance, cannot please God, because such are not Good Works: for when we reject Works done before Justification, we must not reject Justifying Faith it self, nor any thing which is necessary and essential to it, for then we run our selves into such a Labyrinth, out of which we shall never find a way.

And indeed I find that some men are very sensible what weight our Church lays upon

on the neceſſity of Repentance in order to our Juſtification, and uſe ſome little Arts to avoid it: for that Deſcription of Faith which is given us in the firſt part of the Sermon of Faith, concluding thus: *we do truſt that our offences be continually waſhed and purged, whenſoever we repenting truly do return to him with our whole heart, ſtedfaſtly determining with our ſelves through his Grace, to obey and ſerve him in keeping his Commandments, and never to turn back again to ſin*: Which maks Repentance of our ſins, and a ſincere and ſtedfaſt purpoſe of a new life, antecedently neceſſary to the juſtfying Act of Faith: they uſe this evaſion, that the *Homily adds*, [*whenſoever we repenting return to him*] *either with reſpect to future ſins, to the forgiveneſs of which we all acknowledge Repentance to be neceſſary, or elſe to diſtinguiſh a ſaving from a counterfeit and ſudden Faith, not as if true Evangelical Repentance had any influence upon the very Act of Juſtification, as Faith has.*

The firſt account is the ſtrangeſt, that ever I met with; for there can be no imaginable reaſon aſſigned, why Repentance ſhould be neceſſary to obtain the Pardon of thoſe ſins, which we commit after Juſtification, and not neceſſary to our firſt Juſtification: I am ſure neither the Scripture,

pture, nor the Articles and Homilies of our Church, nor the Confeſſions of any Reformed Churches, which I ever yet ſaw, ever made ſuch a diſtinction. The Commiſſion which our Saviour gave to his Apoſtles, was to *preach Repentance and Forgiveneſs of ſins in his Name*, to the unconverted and unjuſtified Jews and Heathens; and both the Homilies of our Church, and the *Auguſtan*-Confeſſion, do in expreſs words found the Doctrine of Repentance upon that firſt Commiſſion given to the Apoſtles, and do thence conclude the neceſſity of Repentance in order to Forgiveneſs: for ſince Juſtification conſiſts in the forgiveneſs of our ſins, a repeated Forgiveneſs is but a repeated Juſtification of a Sinner, and why that ſhould be neceſſary to the after-acts of Juſtification, which was not neceſſary to the firſt, is beyond my Underſtanding.

Auguſt. Confeſſ. Art. XX. Homily of Repentance.

The ſecond account is much better, that it is to diſtinguiſh between a ſaving and a counterfeit Faith: but then this very diſtinction confirms the antecedent neceſſity of Repentance to Juſtification: for the difference between a ſaving and counterfeit Faith, according to this Account, is, that a ſaving Faith ſuppoſes Repentance, or includes it in its very nature,

but

but a counterfeit Faith does not: as for what they add, that Evangelical *Repentance* hath not such an influence upon our Justification, as Faith has, is none of our present dispute; if it be but acknowledged to be antecedently necessary, we will consider the rest hereafter.

And now it is time to proceed to the last thing I proposed, to consider what our Church attributes to Faith in the matter of our Justification: And to state this matter plainly, I shall first enquire, in what sense our Church rejects Works from the Office of Justifying, and attributes it to Faith alone. And secondly what the Office of Faith is in the Justification of a Sinner.

First, In what sense our Church rejects Works from the Office of Justifying, and attributes it to Faith alone. And it is easily observed, that our Church acknowledges the antecedent necessity of some Works to our Justification, as we are expresly taught in the first part of the Sermon of Salvation: *And yet that Faith doth not shut out Repentance, Hope, Love, Dread, and the Fear of God, to be joyned with Faith in every man that is justified, but it shutteth them out from the Office of Justifying: So that although they be all present together in him that is justified,*

*juſtified, yet they juſtifie not all together.* So that no man muſt expect this great Bleſſing of Juſtification, unleſs together with Faith, he have Repentance, Hope, Love, Dread, and the Fear of God: which ſuppoſes, that a man muſt be a true Penitent, and a true Lover of God, before he is juſtified. Though Repentance and Hope, *&c.* have no actual influence upon our Juſtification, yet they are *cauſa ſine quibus non*, ſuch cauſes without which the effect will never follow, which neceſſarily intitles them to the nature of Conditions: for a Condition which hath no natural or meritorious Efficiency, is only a *cauſa ſine quâ non*: and though it is true, that the accidental preſence of one thing with another, which produces any Effect, will not entitle it to any degree of Efficiency, yet where there is ſuch a natural Union between two things, that neither of them can act alone, though the effect may more immediately belong to one than to the other, yet they both concur to it: though the hand does immediately apprehend any thing, or lay hold on it, yet the Shoulder and the Arm is naturally neceſſary to produce this action, becauſe the Hand cannot move of it ſelf: And if they will allow us this ſimilitude, (which they themſelves

ſelves ſometimes uſe) that Good Works be the Shoulder and Arm that upholds Faith, we will allow Faith to be the Hand. And thus it is in Moral Cauſes, where the preſence of two things, of Faith ſuppoſe, and Works, is neceſſarily required in order to the ſame Effect, there muſt be a concurrence of both, though it may be in different manners: When our Church aſſerts the neceſſary preſence of ſome internal Graces and Vertues together with Faith, in him who is to be juſtified, ſhe plainly acknowledges that we ſhall never be juſtified without them, though not for them, which is all that any one deſires, who denies and rejects the Merits of Good Works.

And as theſe internal Acts of Repentance, Hope, *&c.* are antecedently neceſſary to Juſtification, ſo Good Works muſt neceſſarily follow, as we are taught in the ſame place: *Nor the Faith alſo doth not ſhut out the Juſtice of our Good Works, neceſſarily to be done afterwards of Duty towards God (for we are moſt bounden to ſerve God in doing Good Deeds, commanded by him in his holy Scripture all the days of our Life) but it excludeth them, ſo that we may not do them to this intent, to be made good by doing of them:* that is, to be juſtified by them. And this we are taught

taught is ſo neceſſary, that unleſs theſe Good Works follow, as the neceſſary Fruits of Faith, we ſhall looſe our Juſtification again, as you heard above.

In what ſenſe then does our Church reject good Works, and attribute our Juſtification to Faith alone? And that we are told over and over in the moſt plain and expreſs words; that it is only to take away the *Merit of Good Works*, and to attribute our Juſtification to the free Mercy of God, and Merits of Chriſt, not to our own Works and Deſervings. Hence it is that Juſtification by Works is ſo often oppoſed to our Juſtification by the Mercy of God, and the Merits of Chriſt, which are inconſiſtent in no other ſenſe, but that of Merit: for though Good Works be ſuppoſed the neceſſary Conditions of Juſtification, yet if they be acknowledged ſo imperfect as not to merit, we ſhall ſtill need the Merits of Chriſt to expiate our ſins, and the Mercy of God to pardon them, and to accept of our imperfect Services.

But the words of the Homily are very expreſs, where after alledging the concurrent Teſtimonies of the ancient Fathers, for Juſtification without Works, by Faith alone, we have this Explication given of them: *Sermon of Salvation*, part 2.

them: "Nevertheleſs this Sentence, that "we be juſtified by Faith only, is not ſo "meant of them, that the ſaid Juſtifying "Faith is alone in man, without true Re-"pentance, Hope, Charity, Dread and "Fear of God, at any time and ſeaſon; "nor when they ſay we be juſtified freely, "they mean not that we ſhould or might "afterward be idle, and that nothing "ſhould be required on our parts af-"terward: neither they mean not ſo "to be juſtified without Good Works, "that we ſhould do no Good Works at "all: But this ſaying, that we be juſtified "by Faith only, freely, and without "Works, is ſpoken for to take away "clearly all Merit of our Works, as be-"ing unable to deſerve our Juſtification at "Gods hands, and thereby moſt plainly "to expreſs the weakneſs of Man, and the "goodneſs of God, the great infirmity of "our ſelves, and the might and power of "God, the imperfectneſs of our own "Works, and the moſt abundant Grace "of our Saviour Chriſt, and therefore "wholly to aſcribe the Merit and De-"ſerving of our Juſtification to Chriſt "only, and his moſt precious blood-ſhed-"ding.

Hence

Hence for a man to be justified by his own Works, is expounded as if we should affirm, *That a man might by his own Works take away and purge his own sins, and so justifie himself:* That is, when they reject Justification by Works, they understand by it a meritorious Justification.

Thus in the third part of the Sermon of Salvation, we are expresly taught, "That "the true meaning of this Proposition or "Saying, We be justified by Faith in Christ "only (according to the meaning of the old "ancient Authors) is this: We put our "Faith in Christ, that we be justified "by him only, that we be justified by Gods "free Mercy, and the Merits of our Savi- "our Christ only, and by no vertue or "Good Works of our own, that is in us, "or that we can be able to have, or to do, "for to deserve the same, Christ himself "only being the Cause meritorious there- "of.

This is so expresly the Doctrine of the Homilies, that I need not multiply Testimonies for the proof of it; from whence it is evident, that our Church owns the necessity of Good Works to all intents and purposes, excepting Merit, and in this sense they reject Faith too, as it is *our own Work.*

But now becauſe our Church, and all the Reformed Churches, expreſly reject Works in the matter of Juſtification under the notion of Merit and Deſerving, in which ſenſe alone they are injurious to the Grace of God, and the Merits of Chriſt; from whence we argue, that they own the neceſſity of Works upon all other Accounts, and reject only the Merit of them: Some tell us, that we ſhould rather argue, that they put no difference between Works and the Merit of Works, in the matter of Juſtification, but equally reject them both: But pray why ſo? Truly for no Reaſon that I know, but that it beſt ſerves their Hypotheſis.

They acknowledge, that there is a difference between Works and the Merit of Works, but will by no means own, that St. *Paul*, or any of the Reformed Churches made any: which is not very honourably ſaid of them, that they ſhould make no difference, where there is one: which argues either a great deal of ignorance, or meer Sophiſtry. But pray why do they think ſo? Why becauſe St. *Paul* always oppoſes our Juſtification by Works, whatever they are, to Juſtification by Grace; and therefore by Works he muſt underſtand the Merit of Works, becauſe only Merit

is

is oppoſed to Grace: So we ſay too, but what follows from hence? That the Apoſtle rejects all Works, though they are ſeparated from the notion of Merit? This is to make the Apoſtle argue very abſurdly, that becauſe he rejects Works, when they are inconſiſtent with Grace, therefore he ſhould reject Works, when they are not inconſiſtent with Grace, as by this Argument they are not, when they are ſeparated from the notion and opinion of Merit. And what they add, That it is plain, that the Apoſtle excludes all ſorts of Works, of what kind ſoever, from our Juſtification, is very true, but then they are all ſorts of Meritorious Works; that is, ſuch a perfect, legal, unſinning Righteouſneſs, as needs not the Grace and Mercy of God, not ſuch an Evangelical Righteouſneſs, as ows its acceptance to the Grace of God, and the Merits of Chriſt.

The only Argument they have to prove that the Church of *England*, and all the Reformed Churches, make no difference between Works, and the Merit of Works, is becauſe where-ever they reject Juſtification by Works, they expreſly mention their Merit and Deſerving; which is the beſt Argument that can be,

that they do make a difference, otherwiſe there had been no need of that Explication, eſpecially when they aſſert the neceſſity of Good Works upon all other accounts, as our Church expreſly doth.

In the third part of the Sermon of Salvation, we find theſe words: *Truth it is, that our own Works do not juſtifie us, to ſpeak properly of our Juſtification, (that is to ſay) our Works do not merit or deſerve Remiſſion of our ſins, and make us of unjuſt, juſt before God*: What need had there been of this Explication, *to ſpeak properly of Juſtification, that is to ſay, to merit and deſerve*, if our Church had apprehended no difference between Works and Merit, between a proper and improper Juſtification by Works?

I am ſure the Learned Biſhop *Davenant* makes a great difference between the neceſſity of Works, and the Merit of Works, in the Juſtification of a Sinner: for in anſwer to that Queſtion, *Utrum bona Opera dici poſſint ad Juſtificationem vel Salutem neceſſaria*? "Whether Good Works "may be ſaid to be neceſſary to Juſtifica- "tion or Salvation? In his firſt Concluſion he tells us, that in diſpute with the Papiſts it is not ſafe to ſay ſo, becauſe they always by neceſſary, underſtand neceſſary as Cauſes, *vera & propria ſua dignitate meritorias*

De Juſtit. Habit. & act. cap. 31.

*ritorias humanæ ſalutis*, "which by their "own proper worth and dignity merit Sal-"vation: What need had there been of this Caution, if the neceſſity of Good Works to Juſtification, and the Merit of Works, had been the ſame?

In the fourth Concluſion he tells us, That no Good Works are neceſſary to Juſtification, if by neceſſary we underſtand *ſub ratione cauſæ meritoriæ neceſſariæ*, "as ne-"ceſſary meritorious Cauſes.

And in the fifth Concluſion he expreſly tells us, *Bona quædam Opera ſunt neceſſaria ad Juſtificationem, ut conditiones concurrentes, vel præcurſoriæ, licet non ſint neceſſaria, ut cauſæ efficientes, aut meritoriæ*; "That ſome "Good Works are neceſſary to Juſtifica-"tion, as previous or concurring Cauſes, "though not as efficient or meritorious. So that it ſeems, that this diſtinction between the Neceſſity and Merit of Works, was known and defended by the great Patrons of our Church; and we have no reaſon to think, that when our Church does ſo expreſly reject Works only under the notion of Merit, ſhe underſtood no difference between Neceſſity and Merit.

And I find in an ancient Book, intitled, *Reformatio legum, Eccleſiaſticarum*, which was

compoſed by Archbiſhop *Cranmer* and *Peter Martyr*, and ſome other Biſhops and Learned Men of this Church, by the Authority of King *Edward* the Sixth, that where they give an account of thoſe Hereſies, which ought to be ſuppreſſed, all they ſay about Juſtification, is no more but this, *Deinde nec illi ſunt audiendi, quorum impietas ſalutarem & in ſacris Scripturis fundatam Juſtificationis noſtræ doctrinam oppugnant, in qua tenendum eſt, non operum momentis Juſtitiam hominum collocari* : *i. e.* "Neither "muſt we hearken to them, who impiouſ- "ly oppoſe that ſaving Doctrine of Juſti- "fication, which is founded on the Scri- "ptures, concerning which we muſt be- "lieve, that the Righteouſneſs or Juſtifi- "cation of Men does not depend on the "Merits of their Works. So that they only reject the Merit of Works in the matter of Juſtification.

The Confeſſions of Foreign Reformed Churches are as plain and expreſs in this matter, as the Homilies of our Church. In the Apology for the *Auguſtan*-Confeſſion we are told, That good Works are not *pretium, nec propitiatio propter quam detur remiſſio peccatorum*: "They are not the price "nor the propitiation for our ſins. And the reaſon they aſſign, why they oppoſe

De dilectione & impletione legis.

Juſti-

Juſtification by Works, is, becauſe it detracts from the Glory of Chriſt, and ſets up our Works in competition with Chriſt, *utrum fiducia collocanda ſit in Chriſtum, an in opera noſtra*, "Whether we ſhould put our truſt "in Chriſt, or in our own Works: which can be underſtood only in that ſenſe of the Merit of Works, and is no Argument againſt Works, when they are ſubordinate to the Merit and Grace of Chriſt.

Reſponſio ad argum. adverſar.

But not to trouble my Readers with many quotations, I ſhall add but one more, which is their Anſwer to that Objection from St. *James*, who expreſly ſays, That *we are juſtified by Works, and not by Faith only*: *Si non aſſuant adverſarii ſuas opiniones de meritis operum, Jacobi verba nihil habent incommodi*, &c. "If our Adverſaries would not "annex their own opinions concerning "Merit of Works, there is no inconve-"nience in St. *James* his words. So that they were not ſhy of this expreſſion, of being juſtified by Works, ſo men would not imagine, that their Juſtification were owing to the Merit of Works; which is no leſs than a demonſtration, that they made a diſtinction between VVorks and Merit, in the matter of Juſtification.

But there is one very ſurprizing Argument to prove that there can be no difference between Works and Merit, in the matter of Juſtification; and it is this: That if we be juſtified by Works, without reſpect to their Merit, then we may as well be juſtified by Works of an indifferent nature, which have no intrinſick worth and goodneſs in them, as by the moſt real and ſubſtantial Righteouſneſs; for take away Merit, and it is all one what the nature of the Work be: Now the only difficulty of framing an Anſwer to this Argument, is to find what there is to be anſwered: To be juſtified by Works without Merit, if any men phraſe it ſo, can ſignifie no more but this, that God for Chriſts ſake forgives the ſins, and accepts the Perſons of thoſe, who though they be guilty of many Infirmites, yet do heartily and ſincerely endeavour to pleaſe him, and by the practiſe of a real Righteouſneſs do every day aſpire after a greater likeneſs to him; now the queſtion is, Why (ſince theſe men do not merit ſuch favours) ſhould God prefer them before thoſe, who buſie themſelves in ſome external Rites and Ceremonies, or Judaical Obſervances, which have no real Goodneſs in them? And I can give no other account of it, but

that

that it is for the ſame reaſon, for which God prefers an Evangelical before a Ceremonial Righteouſneſs; and if there be no reaſon for this (excepting Merit) I confeſs the Argument is unanſwerable.

Is there no reaſon why God ſhould prefer the internal Habits of Grace and Vertue, which are a participation of his own Nature, and the beginnings (though but weak and imperfect) of a new and ſpiritual Life, and the beſt qualifications for future Glory and Happineſs, before ſome external Rites and Uſages, which have no real worth? Is there no reaſon, why God ſhould prefer the ſubſtantial Acts of Piety and Charity, which are uſeful to Men, and an imitation of the bounty and goodneſs of God, before picking up ſtraws, and ſuch uſeleſs and ludicrous Employments? Is there no difference between Works which are imperfectly good, and Works which have no goodneſs in them? But I think it is a Work of Supererogation, though not very meritorious, to anſwer ſuch an Argument.

But now in requital of this Argument againſt the diſtinction between Works and Merit, I ſhall give another for it, and that is, That our Church makes nothing more neceſſary on our part to our Salvation, than

than to our Juſtification: and therefore when ſhe rejects Good Works from the Office of Juſtifying, if ſhe intends to deny the Neceſſity, as well as the Merit of Good Works, ſhe muſt be underſtood to deny the neceſſity of Good Works to our Salvation alſo, which is an expreſs Contradiction to her declared Doctrine.

There is no ſuch diſtinction as this between Juſtification and Salvation, to be found in any of the Articles or Homilies of our Church, which is a good Argument that our Church knew no ſuch diſtinction, for if ſhe had, we cannot but think, that ſhe would have made uſe of it in expreſs terms at one time or other; there being the ſame occaſion for it then, that there is now. The Sermon or Homily of Juſtification is called the Sermon of Salvation: and theſe words *Juſtification* and *Salvation* are promiſcuouſly uſed in the Homily it ſelf: Thus in the third part of the Sermon of Salvation, we have theſe words at the beginning: *It hath been manifeſtly declared unto you, that no man can fulfil the Law of God, and therefore by the Law all men are condemned: whereupon it followeth neceſſarily, that ſome other thing ſhould be required for our SALVATION than the Law; and that is a true and lively Faith in Chriſt, bringing*

ing

*ing forth good Works, and a Life according to Gods Commandments*: Where Salvation must of neceſſity ſignifie, what at other times is called Juſtification; for our Church tells us, that we cannot be ſaved by the Works of the Law, becauſe we cannot fulfil the Law, which is the reaſon at other times aſſigned, why we cannot be *Juſtified* by the Law. *Becauſe all men be Sinners, and Offenders againſt God, and Breakers of his Law, therefore can no man by his own Acts, Words and Deeds (ſeem they never ſo good) be juſtified and made righteous before God*: Which are the very firſt words of the Sermon of Salvation: And what is here required for our Salvation, is the very ſame, which in other places our Church requires to our Juſtification, *viz. A true and lively Faith in Chriſt, bringing forth Good Works, and a Life according to Gods Commandments.*

Thus in the firſt part of the Sermon of Good Works, our Church cites thoſe words of S. *Chryſoſtom: I can ſhew a man, that by Faith without Works lived & came to heaven, but without Faith never any man had Life: the Thief that was hanged when Chriſt ſuffered, did believe only, and the moſt merciful God juſtified him*: this is an Example of *living and going to Heaven* by Faith without Works, that the Thief was *juſtified* by Faith only; ſo that

that to be juſtified by Faith, and to live and go to Heaven by Faith, it ſeems are equivalent expreſſions, as appears alſo from what follows: *And becauſe no man ſhall ſay again, that he lacked time to do good VVorks, for elſe he would have done them: Truth it is, and I will not contend therein, but this I will ſurely affirm, that Faith only SAVED him:* So that to be juſtified, and to be ſaved by Faith, ſtill ſignifies the ſame thing; and in the ſame ſenſe wherein our Church affirms, that we may be juſtified by Faith only, ſhe affirms, that we may be *ſaved* by Faith only, which therefore muſt not exclude the Neceſſity, but the Merit of Good Works; and whenever Faith only will not juſtifie, it will not ſave neither, as it follows; *If he had lived, and not regarded Faith, and the Works thereof, he ſhould have loſt his Salvation again*: That is, his Juſtification, as appears from the whole Diſcourſe.

The Learned Biſhop *Davenant* certainly was not acquainted with this diſtinction, when he propoſed that Queſtion, *Utrum bona Opera ſint neceſſaria ad Juſtificationem vel Salutem*, Whether Good Works be neceſſary to Juſtification or Salvation, and anſwers it without making any difference between their neceſſity to Juſtification and

and to Salvation, which is not very reconcileable with our Modern Divinity, in which good Works are so far from being owned necessary, that they are judged dangerous and hurtful in reference to Justification, though they may be necessary to our Salvation.

And indeed this distinction between Justification and Salvation was on purpose invented to mollifie some harsh expressions of later Divines, who rejected good Works and a holy Life, from having any thing to do in the Justification of a Sinner: This gave birth to the *Antinomian* Heresie, which wholly rejects the Law and good VVorks, and under a pretence of advancing the freeness of Gods Grace, delivers Believers from all the necessary Obligations of Duty and Obedience; to prevent the infection of this Doctrine, they invented this distinction between Justification and Salvation; and asserted, that though Good VVorks are not necessary to our Justification, yet they are to our Salvation; which is as much as to say, that though our sins shall be pardoned, and our persons accepted, and accounted perfectly righteous, and have an actual Right and Title to future Glory without Holiness and Obedience, yet we shall never have

an

an actual Poſſeſſion of Glory, but upon the condition of an holy Life; which were it true, would be a greater blemiſh to the VViſdom and Juſtice of God, than the neceſſity of Holineſs to our Juſtification, can be to the freeneſs of his Grace.

Having explained in what ſenſe our Church rejects Good VVorks from the Office of Juſtifying, *viz.* That nothing which we can do is ſo perfect as to merit and deſerve Juſtification, it is time to conſider what our Church attributes to Faith in the Juſtification of a Sinner, and upon what account ſhe affirms, *That Faith only juſtifies*: And I cannot better explain this, than in the words of the Homily it ſelf, which are theſe: *Truth it is, that our own Works do not juſtifie us, to ſpeak properly of Juſtification, (that is to ſay) our Works do not merit or deſerve remiſſion of our ſins, and make us of unjuſt juſt before God: But God of his own Mercy through the only Merits & Deſervings of his Son Jeſus Chriſt doth juſtifie us. Nevertheleſs becauſe Faith doth directly ſend us to Chriſt for remiſſion of our ſins, and that by Faith given us of God we embrace the Promiſe of Gods Mercy, and of the remiſſion of our ſins, (which thing none other of our Vertues or Works properly doth) therefore Scripture uſeth to ſay, That Faith without VVorks doth juſtifie; and for-*

*Sermon of Salvation*, part 3.

*forasmuch that it is all one Sentence in effect, to say Faith without Works, and only Faith doth justifie us: therefore the old ancient Fathers of the Church from time to time, have uttered our Justification with this speech, Only Faith justifieth us; meaning none other thing than St.* Paul *meant, when he said, Faith without works justifieth us. And because all this is brought to pass through the only Merits and Deservings of our Saviour Christ, and not through our Merits, or through the merit of any Vertue that we have within us, or of any Work that cometh from us, therefore in that respect of Merit and Deserving, we forsake (as it were) altogether again, Faith, Works, and all other Vertues. For our own imperfection is so great, through the corruption of original sin, that all is unperfect that is within us, Faith, Charity, Hope, Dread, Thoughts, Words, and Works; and therefore not apt to merit or deserve any part of our Justification for us. And this form of speaking use we, in humbling of our selves to God, and to give all the Glory to our Saviour Christ, which is best worthy to have it.*

These words are so plain, that they need no comment; and there are three things contained in them, which do evidently declare the sense of our Church in this matter.

First,

First, That our Church does not attribute our Justification to Faith, upon account of any Merit or Desert in Faith above other Vertues and Graces: for *in respect of Merit and Deserving*, we are taught *to forsake again Faith* it self, as well *as Works, and all other Vertues*: *As our Works do not merit or deserve remission of our sins*, no more does Faith.

Secondly, That the reason why our Church attributes our Justification to Faith only, is to declare that we owe our Justification wholly to the Mercy of God, and the Merits of Christ: *That God of his own Mercy, through the only Merits and Deservings of his Son Jesus Christ doth justifie us.* And thus immediately before we are told, *That the meaning of this Proposition or saying, We be justified by Faith in Christ only, (according to the meaning of the old ancient Authors) is this, we put our Faith in Christ, that we be justified by him only, that we be justified by Gods free Mercy, and the Merits of our Saviour Christ only, and by no vertue or good Works of our own, that is in us, or that we can be able to have or to do, for to deserve the same; Christ himself only being the Cause meritorious thereof.* So that whoever attributes the Justification of a Sinner wholly to the Mercy of God, and the Merits of Christ,

Chriſt, without any other intervening Merit or Deſert, though he may differ in the phraſe and manner of expreſſion, yet does acknowledge all that our Church means, by being juſtified by Faith only, and cannot juſtly be charged with deſerting or oppoſing the Doctrin of our Church.

And therefore, Thirdly, the true Reaſon why our Church attributes our Juſtification to Faith only, and not to Juſtice, or Charity, or the Love of God, or any other Grace or Virtue, is this, becauſe Faith only connects the neceſſity of Obedience and a Holy Life with the Mercy of God, and the Merits of Chriſt; and thereby both ſecures and enforces our Duty, and attributes the glory of all to Free Grace, which is the great deſign of our Church. For Juſtifying Faith, according to the ſenſe of our Church, (as abundantly appears from what I have diſcourſed above) includes in its own nature Repentance and the Love of God, and the ſincere purpoſes of a new Life, which as opportunity ſerves, muſt actually produce all the Fruits of Righteouſneſs; for without this we cannot embrace the Promiſe of Pardon and Forgiveneſs, which is made upon the condition of Repentance

and a new Life: But then it is the proper office of Faith, when we have done our beſt, to depend upon the Mercy of God through our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, to pardon our many ſins and defects, and to accept and reward our imperfect ſervices; which attributes the glory of all not to our Merits and Deſerts, but to the Grace and Mercy of God. Thus our Church tells us, that the reaſon why Faith only is ſaid to juſtifie, is becauſe *Faith doth directly ſend us to Chriſt for Remiſſion of our Sins, and that by Faith given us of God, we embrace the Promiſe of Gods Mercy, and of the Remiſſion of our Sins, which thing none other of our Virtues or Works properly doth:* That is, Juſtice or Charity, or any other Virtue doth not in its own nature include a dependence on the Grace and Mercy of God for its Acceptance and Reward; and therefore ſhould we be juſtified by theſe Virtues, conſidered as diſtinct from Faith, which alone embraces the Promiſe of Mercy, we muſt be juſtified by their proper Merit and Deſert, not by the Mercy of God, and the Merits of Chriſt. But now Faith is not only an active and vigorous Principle of a new Life, but in its own nature includes a neceſſary dependence on the Promiſe of Pardon: it ſends to Chriſt for the Remiſ-

Remiſſion of our ſins, not immediately, for this is not the firſt act of Faith; but when we have done our beſt, it teaches us to renounce the Merit of our own Works, and to truſt in the Mercy of God through our Lord Jeſus Chriſt for our Pardon and Reward, which aſcribes the Praiſe of all to the Mercy of God.

Upon the ſame account our Church tells us, that *Faith doth not ſhut out Repentance, Love, Dread, and the Fear of God to be joyned with Faith in every man that is juſtified; but yet it ſhutteth them out from the office of Juſtifying; ſo that though they be all preſent in him that is juſtified, yet they juſtifie not all together.* Where by theſe good Works being joyned with Faith, and being preſent in him that is juſtified, is meant, that they are eſſential to a Juſtifying Faith, and muſt be *preſent*, as antecedent qualifications or conditions, without which God will not juſtifie us; as appears from what I have diſcourſt above concerning the nature of Juſtifying Faith, which includes Repentance and the Love of God, *&c.* as antecedently neceſſary to our embracing the Promiſe of Pardon and Forgiveneſs, which is not the firſt, but the laſt and completing act of Faith: For if theſe good Works be not one way or Sermon of Salvation, part 1.

other neceſſary to our Juſtification, no reaſon can be aſſigned why they ſhould be preſent in him that is juſtified; for Faith might then juſtifie alone without the Preſence, as well as without the Merit and Efficacy of our good Works.

And therefore when Faith is ſaid *to ſhut out theſe good Works from the office of Juſtifying, that though they be all preſent, yet they do not juſtifie all together*; the deſign is not to deny the Neceſſity, but the Merit of good Works. This is plain from the Reaſon, which is immediately aſſigned, why theſe good Works cannot juſtifie, becauſe *all the good Works we can do be imperfect, and therefore not able to deſerve our Juſtification*; which is the conſtant Doctrin of the Homilies: For our Church by Juſtification perpetually underſtands a *meritorious*, and not a *conditional* Juſtification, and therefore whatever juſtifies in this ſenſe muſt by its own Virtue or Merit expiate our ſins, which is the reaſon alledged, *why no man can make himſelf righteous* (that is, juſtifie himſelf) *by his own Works, neither in part nor in the whole, for that were the greateſt Preſumption in Man, that Antichriſt could ſet up againſt God, to affirm that a man might by his own Works take away and purge his own ſins, and ſo juſtifie himſelf. SO*, that is, by the Merit and Virtue of his own Works. And

And Faith it ſelf conſidered as our *own Act*, hath no greater privilege upon this account, than any other Grace or Virtue; *for in reſpect of Merit and Deſerving we forſake altogether again Faith, Works and all other Virtues.* Faith does not juſtifie *as our own Act*; that is, it does not merit our Juſtification, as it muſt do, if it juſtifie as our own Act; which in the ſenſe of our Church ſignifies, that we do ſomething ſo meritorious, as to deſerve Juſtification at Gods hands: *But now Juſtification is the office of God only, and is not a thing which we render to him,* (that is, we can offer him nothing of our own to merit our Juſtification) *but which we receive from him, not which we give to him, but which we take of him, by his free Mercy, and by the only Merits of his dearly beloved Son our only Redeemer, Juſtifier and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt.* *Sermon of Salvation, part 2.*

But for this reaſon Faith only is ſaid to juſtifie, and to ſhut out our own Works, and itſelf alſo conſidered as our own Act, from the office of juſtifying; becauſe though it ſtrongly enforce the Neceſſity of good Works, yet in its own nature it excludes all opinion of Merit and Deſert. For Faith has a neceſſary reſpect to the Promiſe of Mercy and Forgiveneſs, and whoever acknowledges that

he ows his Juſtification to the Mercy of God, who for the ſake of Chriſt pardons his Sins, and rewards his Imperfect Services (as all thoſe muſt do, who hope to be ſaved by Faith in the notion of our Church) does plainly confeſs, that his Works are imperfect, and cannot deſerve his Juſtification, which takes away all opinion of Merit from our ſelves, and attributes the glory of all to the Mercy of God, and the Merits of Chriſt.

I ſhall only obſerve three things from this Diſcourſe, which are very material to our preſent purpoſe.

Firſt, that our Church was not acquainted with that Diſtinction in the modern ſenſe of it, that we are juſtified *fide ſolâ*, but not *ſolitariâ*; by Faith alone, but not by that Faith which is alone: the meaning of which according to ſome Modern Divines is this, *That we are juſtified only by that particular Act of Faith, which apprehends the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, and relies and rolls itſelf on Chriſt for Salvation, and applies his Merits and Righteouſneſs to the Soul*; without any regard to Repentance and the Love of God, or any other Grace or Virtue: That though at the ſame time God infuſe the habits of all Graces and Virtues into a juſtified perſon, yet in the

Act

Act of juſtifying, he hath no regard at all to Repentance or any other Grace; but we are juſtified in order of nature before theſe are infuſed into us, and without any reſpect to them: And ſome men would willingly affix this Notion, as abſurd as it is, to our Church, becauſe ſhe only requires the preſence of theſe Graces and Virtues in the juſtified perſon, but ſhuts them out from the office of Juſtifying. But I have made it appear, that theſe words admit a better ſenſe, and that Juſtification *by Faith only* in the modern Notion of it, ſo as to exclude the antecedent Neceſſity of Repentance, or any other internal Grace or Virtue, is contrary to the conſtant doctrin of our Church which requires the preſence of theſe Graces, as antecedent conditions or qualifications, though it ſhut them out from being the meritorious Cauſes of Juſtification.

And to confirm this, I obſerve ſecondly, that our Church doth not attribute our Juſtification to any particular Act of Faith: She frequently indeed inculcates the embracing of the Promiſe of Pardon and Forgiveneſs, as eſſential to a juſtifying Faith; but the reaſon of that is not becauſe that particular Act juſtifies us, but to attribute our Juſtification not to

the Merit of our own works, but to the Mercy of God: But ſhe expreſly affirms, that Faith doth not juſtifie as our own Act; that Juſtification is not the office of Man, but of God; and if we be not juſtified by Faith, as our own Act, much leſs can any particular Act of Faith (which if it be conſidered as an Act, muſt be conſidered as our own Act) juſtifie; which overthrows that Inſtrumentality of Faith in Juſtification, which theſe men talk of: but the plain meaning of our being juſtified by Faith only is this, that God will pardon our ſins, and reward us with eternal life, if we repent of our ſins, and believe and obey the Goſpel of his Son, truſting wholly in the Mercies of God, and in the Merits and Mediation of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, as it is expreſt at large in the Homily: *That the true underſtanding and meaning of our being juſtified by Faith without Works, or by Faith in Chriſt only, is this, that although we hear Gods Word, and believe it, although we have Faith, Hope, Charity, and do never ſo many good Works thereunto; yet we muſt renounce the Merit of all the ſaid Virtues, of Faith, Hope, Charity, and all other Virtues and good deeds, which we either have done, ſhall do, or can do, as things that be far too weak and inſufficient and imperfect to deſerve*

Serm. of Salvation part 2.

*ſerve Remiſſion of our Sins, and our Juſtification; and therefore we muſt truſt only in Gods Mercy, and that Sacrifice which our High Prieſt and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt the Son of God once offered for us upon the Croſs, to obtain thereby Gods Grace and Remiſſion, as well of our Original Sin in Baptiſm, as of all actual Sins committed by us after Baptiſm, if we truly repent and unfeignedly turn to him.* All this is called being juſtified by Faith only, which includes a renouncing the Merits and Deſerts of our own Works, but firſt requires that we ſhould do good Works, before we renounce the Merit of them; and an affiance in the Mercy of God for Pardon and Forgiveneſs, upon the conditions of Repentance and a new Life. This is all I contend for, which is the *Antient Catholick Doctrin of our Church*, againſt thoſe modern notions of Reliance and Recumbency, or the virtue of any particular Act of Faith in the Juſtification of a Sinner.

Thirdly, I obſerve, that ſhould any man affirm in expreſs words, that we are juſtified by Works as well as by Faith, meaning no more by it, than that good Works are the neceſſary Conditions, not the meritorious Cauſes of our Juſtification, though he would differ in the manner

ner of expreſſion, yet he would agree with our Church in the true notion of Juſtification; whereas thoſe who uſe the ſame phraſe of being juſtified by Faith only, and by Faith without Works, thereby excluding the antecedent neceſſity of Repentance and Holineſs to our Juſtification, though they retain the ſame form of words, yet renounce the conſtant Doctrin of our Church, and are the only Apoſtates and Innovators. Which may ſatisfie any man, how unjuſtly I am charged with corrupting the Doctrin of our Church, when I have only expreſſed the true ſenſe and meaning of it in ſuch words, as are leſs liable to be miſtaken; and how vainly my Adverſaries pretend to be ſuch *Obedient Sons* of the Church of *England*, when under an Orthodox Form of Words, they have introduced ſuch Doctrins as are diametrically oppoſite to the declared ſenſe of this Church.

After this large and particular Account of the Doctrin of the Church of *England* concerning the Juſtification of a Sinner, it is time in the ſecond place to conſider, how the ſtate of the Controverſie is altered at this day; and how thoſe men, whom I oppoſe, have corrupted the Doctrin, as well as rejected the Authority of

of our Church: And though I have already given ſufficient Intimations of this, yet it may be of great uſe more particularly to ſhew how directly oppoſite theſe new and fantaſtick Notions are to the eſtabliſht Doctrin contained in our Articles and Homilies, which though it would admit of a very large Diſcourſe, I ſhall comprize in as few words as may be.

And firſt whereas our Church expreſly aſſerts, that in the Juſtification of a Sinner, on Gods part is required Mercy and Grace; Juſtification conſiſting in the free Pardon of all our ſins: Mr. *Ferguſon* (very agreeably indeed to his own Principles) expreſly aſſerts, that Juſtification does not conſiſt in the Pardon of ſin, nor is it the reſult of Mercy, but the off-ſpring of Juſtice. *Remiſſion* (as he acknowledges) *is the reſult of Mercy, and the act of one exerciſing Favour; but Juſtification is the off ſpring of Juſtice, and imports one tranſacting with us in a juridical way without the infringement of Law or Equity.* This Notion I have examined already, and ſhall add nothing further for the Confutation of it: It is directly contrary to the Doctrin of our Homilies, and I hope that is Argument enough with theſe men, who pretend ſuch a mighty veneration for the *Antient and Catho-*

*Vide ſupra* p. 152. &c.

*Catholick Doctrin* of our Church. But then if any man ſhould wonder (as well he may) how a Sinner ſhould be juſtified in this Law-notion according to the ſtrict Rules of Juſtice, that is, that a Sinner is juſtified, not by being pardoned, but by being acquitted and abſolved, as an innocent man, who has never offended; the account of this will farther diſcover what Friends they are to the Doctrin of our Church.

For ſecondly, whereas the Church of *England* requires no more on Chriſts part, *but Juſtice, or the Satisfaction of Gods Juſtice, or the Price of our Redemption*, which makes him *the meritorious Cauſe of our Juſtification*, that God for Chriſts ſake forgives the ſins of true Penitents; theſe men place our Juſtification *in the Imputation of Chriſts perſonal Righteouſneſs to us.* They tell us, that Chriſt as our Surety and Mediator hath fulfilled all Righteouſneſs *for us*, and *in our ſtead*; and that by being clothed with his perfect Righteouſneſs, we are accounted perfectly righteous; and ſo are juſtified, not as Malefactors, when they are pardoned, but as righteous and innocent men, who are acquitted and abſolved. And I have already informed Mr. *Ferguſon*, how effectually this Notion under-

*Sup.* p. 156

mines

mines the neceſſity of an inherent Righteouſneſs.

To be juſtified by the Merits of Chriſt, ſignifies no more than to be juſtified by the gracious Terms and Conditions of the Goſpel, which is founded on the Merits of Chriſt, which was purchaſed and ſealed with his meritorious Bloud: For the Merits of Chriſt do not immediately juſtifie any man, but whereas ſtrict Juſtice will not admit of Repentance, nor accept of an imperfect, though ſincere Obedience, God has for the ſake of Chriſt who hath expiated our ſins by his Death, entered into a Covenant of Grace and Mercy, wherein he promiſes Pardon to true Penitents; and this neceſſarily requires an inherent Holineſs not to merit, but to qualifie us for the Grace of God: But if we be made righteous by a perfect Righteouſneſs imputed to us, if this will anſwer all the demands of Law and Juſtice, what need is there of an imperfect Righteouſneſs of our own?

The Righteouſneſs of Chriſt imputed to us makes us righteous as Chriſt is, and what need is there then of any Righteouſneſs of our own? which would be according to the Proverb *to burn day*, and to *light up Candles in the Sun.*

Dr. *Owen*

Dr. *Owen* takes notice of this Objection, and pretends to give an Anſwer to it, which muſt be a little conſidered, for a little will ſerve the turn. And firſt he obſerves, that *here is a great difference, if it were no more than that this Righteouſneſs was inherent in Chriſt and properly his own, it is only reckoned and imputed to us, or freely beſtowed on us.* But does not this Imputation make it ours? How then can we anſwer the demands of the Law with it? Is any thing the leſs ours, becauſe it is not originally ours, but ſo by Gift? And the Doctor was ſenſible that this Anſwer would not do, and therefore ſecondly he tells us, *the Truth is, that Chriſt was not righteous with that Righteouſneſs for himſelf, but for us.* How plain are things when men will ſpeak out! So that now it ſeems this Righteouſneſs is not ſo properly Chriſts Righteouſneſs as ours: he had no need to fulfil all Righteouſneſs for himſelf, but for us, as our Mediator and Surety: *So that here can be no compariſon* between the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt inherent in him, and imputed to us; becauſe it is not ſo much his Righteouſneſs, as ours. But was not Chriſt perſonally righteous with this Righteouſneſs? Did he ſo fulfil Righteouſneſs for us, that he him-

Commun. P. 187.

himſelf had no intereſt in it? Can it be inherent in him, and he not righteous by it? And if Chriſt in his private capacity, as a man ſubject to the Law, were righteous with that very Righteouſneſs, which makes us righteous, then we are righteous as Chriſt is, and not *only righteous with his Righteouſneſs, which he wrought for us, and that completely*, but righteous with the very ſame Righteouſneſs, that makes him righteous; which excludes indeed all compariſon, as the Doctor well obſerves, becauſe we cannot ſo properly compare a thing with it ſelf, but it demonſtrates the Identity or Sameneſs of this Righteouſneſs.

And here unleſs I will prove my ſelf an arrant Coward, I muſt accept that Challenge the Doctor has ſent me to ſtand to that Reſolution I gave in my former Diſcourſe to that Queſtion, *What Influence the Sacrifice of Chriſts Death, and the Righteouſneſs of his Life have upon our Acceptance with God?* Which ſignifies no more than what is meant by our being ſaved by the Merits and Righteouſneſs of Chriſt; and the Anſwer I gave to it is this, *That all I can find in Scripture about it is, that to this we ow the Covenant of Grace: that God being well pleaſed with the Obedience of Chriſts Life, and with* Vindicat. p. 232.

*with the Sacrifice of his Death, for his ſake entred into a new Covenant with Mankind, wherein he promiſes Pardon of Sin and Eternal Life to thoſe who believe and obey the Goſpel.* Now I would deſire the Doctor to take notice, that I ſtand to this, and accept his Challenge, let him chuſe what ſeconds or thirds or fourths he pleaſes. *This Aſſertion* (the Doctor ſays) *cannot be reconciled to common Senſe, or the fundamental Principles of Chriſtian Religion.* And indeed he has diſcovered a great many Abſurdities in it, which are enough to put any man out of conceit with ſuch a Doctrin; for hence it follows (if we will believe him, for we have only his bare word for it) *That God entred into a new Covenant originally only for the ſake of thoſe things, whereby that Covenant was ratified and confirmed.* But how does this follow? Did I ever affirm, that the Death of Chriſt did only *ratifie* and *confirm* the Covenant? Do I not every where aſſert that Chriſts Death did procure and purchaſe, as well as ſeal the Covenant of Grace? And I hope God may be ſaid to enter into Covenant for the ſake of a meritorious Cauſe. What he means by Gods *originally* entring into Covenant, I cannot tell, unleſs it be, that this was the firſt moving cauſe of

Gods

Gods entring into Covenant: but this can not be attributed to the Death of Christ upon any account, but to that free Grace which first contrived the way of our Recovery, and sent Christ into the world to accomplish it.

But however, does it not follow from this Assertion, *That Christ was so the Mediator of the new Covenant, that he died not for the Redemption of Transgressions under the first Covenant, whereby the whole Consideration of his Satisfaction, and of Redemption properly so called, is excluded; that there is no consideration to be had of his Purchase of the Inheritance of Grace and Glory, with many other things of the same importance.* I see unless the Doctor get a very good *Second*, there is no great danger in accepting his Challenge: for is there any appearance of consequence in this, that because Christ by his Death purchased and sealed the new Covenant, that therefore he did not die for the Redemption of sins under the first Covenant, nor to purchase the Inheritance of Grace and Glory? That which purchases a Covenant, purchases every thing contained in it: Now the new Covenant contains the Promise of Forgiveness of sin, and therefore whatever sins are pardoned in the new Covenant, were Ibid.

expiated by the Death of Chriſt, without which there is no Remiſſion, and conſequently could be no Promiſe of Remiſſion: The new Covenant contains the Promiſes of Grace and Glory, and therefore Grace and Glory are as much the purchaſe of Chriſts Death, as the new Covenant is.

The plain account of the matter is this, That Chriſt hath expiated our ſins by his meritorious Death and Sufferings, and hath purchaſed the Pardon of ſin and eternal Life; and whatever Chriſt hath purchaſed by his Death, God hath promiſed to beſtow on us in the new Covenant: So that the whole virtue of Chriſts Death is contained in the Covenant of Grace, *i. e.* whatever he has purchaſed for us by his Death is there promiſed, and we muſt expect no other benefit by the Death of Chriſt, than to be ſaved according to the conditions of the new Covenant, which ſignifies the ſame thing with being juſtified and ſaved by the Merits of Chriſt; and convinces us of the neceſſity of inherent Holineſs, which is the condition of the Goſpel Covenant.

The laſt Abſurdity the Doctor has diſcovered in my Aſſertion, argues him to be a man of a very deep reach; *That the Goſpel*

*Goſpel or the Doctrin of the Goſpel is the new Covenant, which is only a perſpicuous Declaration of it*: Now ſuppoſe this were never ſo great an Abſurdity, how am I concerned in it? when I expreſly ſay, that the new Covenant (let it be what it will) is owing to the Merits and Righteouſneſs of Chriſt: Though it is a mighty ſubtil Diſtinction between the new Covenant, and the perſpicuous Declaration of it; which is like diſtinguiſhing between a Law or Contract, and the Words whereby it is expreſſed: How eaſie is it for ſuch nice Metaphyſical Wits to find or make Abſurdities in any thing!

But to proceed, I obſerve thirdly, that whereas our Church attributes our Juſtification to ſuch a Faith as comprehends in its notion Repentance and the Love of God, and all internal Graces and Virtues, and a ſincere purpoſe and reſolution to reform our Lives and external Converſation, and makes all this abſolutely neceſſary to our Juſtification; theſe men on the contrary attribute our Juſtification to a particular Act of Faith, which they call a fiducial Reliance or Recumbency on Chriſt for Salvation, abſtracted from Repentance or the Love of God, or any othe Grace or Virtue. And

this I confeſs is very agreeable to their notion of Juſtification by the Imputation of Chriſts perſonal Righteouſneſs to us; for if we are made righteous only by being clothed with the perfect Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, nothing more can be required of us in order to our Juſtification, but to apply the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt to our ſelves, which they tell us is done by coming to Chriſt for Salvation, by receiving Chriſt, by reſting and relying and rolling on Chriſt: There is no uſe of Repentance or Charity or the Love of God in this affair, for they cannot apply the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt to us. If we come to Chriſt for Righteouſneſs, we muſt come without any Righteouſneſs of our own: And yet it is hard to underſtand how this fiducial Reliance on Chriſt can apply his Righteouſneſs to us; a confident Perſuaſion that Chriſt is ours may make a fanciful application of his Righteouſneſs to us, but a mere Reliance on Chriſt makes no application, but only ſignifies a Hope, that it ſhall be applied: And if they will be true to their Principles, that we are juſtified by the Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs to us, which is God's act, whereby he applies the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, I cannot under-

underſtand how we can be juſtified by applying his Righteouſneſs to our ſelves by Faith, which, if it have any ſenſe, muſt ſignifie our imputing the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt to our ſelves (for the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt can be applied to us only by Imputation) which makes our Juſtification our own Act, and not Gods: For it is as abſurd to the full to ſay, that Faith is an Inſtrument in doing that which is intirely Gods act, or that our Imputation of Chriſts Righteouſneſs to our ſelves is an Inſtrument of Gods imputing his Righteouſneſs to us. And then it is worth conſidering which of theſe two Imputations muſt go firſt; if we apply, that is impute, the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt to our ſelves before God has imputed it, this is a falſe Confidence and Preſumption; if God imputes it firſt, then we are actually juſtified, and there needs no Imputation or Application of Faith to make this Righteouſneſs ours: all that can be ſaid in this caſe, is what the *Antinomians* affirm, that we are firſt juſtified before we believe, and that Faith is only a Sign or Evidence, not an Inſtrument of our Juſtification.

But to let paſs the Abſurdities of this Doctrin, every one may perceive how dif-

ferent this notion is from the ſenſe of the Church of *England*, which does not attribute our Juſtification to Faith as our own Act, much leſs to any particular Act of Faith; but by Juſtification by *Faith only* intends no more than that God will pardon our ſins, if we repent of them, and reform our Lives, and truſt in the Mercies of God through the Merits and Mediation of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt: according to the ſenſe of our Church, the ſole object of our truſt is the Mercy of God through the Merits of Chriſt, and therefore the proper Act of Faith is to embrace the Promiſe of Pardon upon the conditions of Repentance and a new Life; we muſt firſt repent of our ſins, and reform our Lives, and then rely on the Mercy of God for our Pardon and Reward. But according to this new Divinity, the ſole object of our truſt and reliance is the perfect and perſonal Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, which ſhuts out the Mercy of God, and the meritorious Death and Sacrifice of Chriſt, and the Promiſes of Pardon, and the neceſſity of an inherent and perſonal Righteouſneſs, as abundantly appears from what I have diſcourſt above.

But

But fourthly, whereas our Church makes Chriſt only the meritorious cauſe of our Juſtification, but ſtill requires on our part Faith and Repentance and the Love of God, as antecedent conditions of our Juſtification, theſe men found all our hopes of Juſtification *immediately* on the Perſon of Chriſt. Every good Chriſtian hopes to be juſtified and ſaved by Chriſt, but not to be immediately ſaved by Chriſt, *i.e.* by a bare Union to his Perſon, but by believing his Goſpel and obeying his Laws, which are neceſſarily required on our part to give us an Intereſt in his Merits and Righteouſneſs: but to aſſert that nothing is neceſſary to our Juſtification, but to apply Chriſt and his Righteouſneſs to our ſelves by a fiducial Reliance and Recumbency, is to place our hopes immediately in the Perſon of Chriſt, which is the foundation of *Antinomianiſm*.

For this reaſon among others, I charged them in my former Diſcourſe with ſetting up the Perſon of Chriſt in oppoſition to his Goſpel, and making a new Religion of the Perſon of Chriſt diſtinct from and contrary to the Religion of his Goſpel. For the Goſpel requires a great many previous conditions to entitle us to

the Merits and Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, as that we muſt repent of our ſins and reform our Lives, and become new Creatures, and then God will pardon and reward us for the ſake of Chriſt; but if an immediate Application of the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt to our ſelves by a fanciful and Enthuſiaſtick Faith will make all Chriſt ours, this makes all the conditions of the Goſpel void and uſeleſs, and ſets up the *Perſon of Chriſt* and his *Perſonal Righteouſneſs* inſtead of his Laws and Religion. The Goſpel attributes the Pardon of our ſins, and the Acceptance of our imperfect Services to the virtue and efficacy of Chriſts Sacrifice and Righteouſneſs, and thus we are made righteous by Chriſt, as by a meritorious Cauſe: But in this way the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt muſt ſerve inſtead of a perſonal and inherent Righteouſneſs, which makes us ſo innocent, that we need no Pardon, and ſo perfectly righteous, that we merit a Reward.

This I take to be the grand Miſcarriage in theſe mens Divinity, which indeed is the foundation of *Antinomianiſm* (though the miſtake be very taking and popular, which makes an oppoſition to it very odious) that whereas Chriſt is our Life and our Righteouſneſs, our Wiſdom and Power,

Power, and the Author of all ſpiritual Bleſſings, but does not diſpenſe theſe Bleſſings immediately to us, but in ſuch ways and methods, and upon ſuch terms and conditions, as are preſcribed and declared in the Goſpel; theſe men ſend us immediately to the Perſon of Chriſt for Life and Righteouſneſs, for Beauty and Comlineſs, for Grace and Wiſdom, and for the ſupply of all our ſpiritual wants, which ſhuts out his Goſpel and Religion, or makes it wholly uſeleſs; and let but Dr. *Owen* ſtand to what he aſſerts in his Vindication: *We do not imagin, but believe from the Scripture, and with the whole Church of God, that we receive Grace and Salvation from the Perſon of Chriſt, in thoſe diſtinct ways, wherein they are capable of being received*; if by that he means, ſuch ways as are preſcribed in the Goſpel, and I declare, I have no controverſie with him about this matter. P. 151,

Thus for inſtance Chriſt is *our Righteouſneſs*, as he is the meritorious cauſe of the Pardon of our ſins, and the Acceptance of our ſincere but imperfect ſervices; but the way to be made righteous by Chriſt, is not *immediately* to go to Chriſt for Righteouſneſs, with all our ſins and impurities about us, to be cloathed with his perfect

and

and perſonal Righteouſneſs, but to repent of our ſins and to believe and obey the Goſpel, and then we ſhall be pardoned and rewarded for Chriſts ſake.

Thus Chriſt is our Wiſdom, as he has reveled thoſe hidden Treaſures of the Divine Wiſdom, which were conceled from former ages, but we muſt not go *immediately* to the Perſon of Chriſt for this Wiſdom, but we muſt ſearch for it in the Goſpel, where it is reveled; and beg thoſe divine Aſſiſtances, which are neceſſary to enlighten our minds, and to bleſs our Studies and Enquiries.

Thus we muſt receive all ſupernatural Aids and Aſſiſtances from Chriſt to renew and ſanctifie our Natures, and to make us holy as God is, Chriſt hath by his Death purchaſt the Gift of the Holy Spirit for thoſe who believe: but we muſt not expect to receive theſe vital Influences from Chriſt by ſuch a natural conveyance as water flows out of a fountain, or as the animal Spirits are communicated to the Members of the natural Body; but we muſt conſider and meditate, and affect our minds with all the Motives and Arguments of our Religion, and derive ſtrength and power from the conſideration of Chriſts Death and Sufferings

ferings, and Reſurrection, and Aſcenſion into Heaven, and Interceſſion for us at Gods right hand, *&c.* to mortifie our Luſts, and to transform us into a Divine Nature: We muſt read and pray, and watch and faſt, and communicate at the Lords Table, and by theſe means put our ſelves under the guidance and conduct of the Divine Spirit, who will never fail to do his part, when we are ſo diligent in doing ours: But a bare truſt and reliance on the Perſon of Chriſt will not entitle us to his Divine Aids, no more than a preſumptuous Dependence on the Providence of God will ſecure a ſlothful man from want and beggery. Chriſt is the fountain of all ſpiritual life, but we muſt not look on this as a perſonal Grace in Chriſt, which muſt be immediately derived from his Perſon; but as an act of Goodneſs and Power in the Adminiſtration of his ſpiritual Kingdom, which is therefore diſpenſed in ſuch regular ways, that every one that pleaſes may certainly know how to obtain it, and that no man muſt expect it any other way.

But now thoſe Perſons whom I oppoſe, if we may judge of their meaning by their words, ſend ſinners immediately to Chriſt for Life and Righteouſneſs, for

Wiſdom

Wiſdom and Power, *&c.* and make all theſe perſonal Graces, which muſt be derived immediately from the Perſon of Chriſt, when indeed they are no other than the effects of his Prophetical, Prieſtly or Regal Offices, in publiſhing the Will of God to us, or in expiating our Sins, or in governing his Church, and diſpenſing his Grace in ſuch ways and methods, as he has preſcribed in the Goſpel.

Knowledg of Chriſt, p. 201. Edit. 2. P. 140.

And therefore as I obſerved in my former Diſcourſe, they have either found out a new *Perſon for Chriſt diſtinct from his Godhead and Manhood*; or which comes to the ſame thing, have *dreſt up* the *Perſon* of Chriſt with ſuch perſonal Graces as do not belong to his Perſon as God-Man, but are the effects of his Mediation. And here the Doctor and Mr. *Ferguſon*, and the reſt of my Opponents raiſe a great cry, and tell the world, that *what I charge them with as a Fault, that they have found out a Perſon for Chriſt diſtinct from his Godhead and Manhood, they think not to have done it, would have been as far from Wit, as Truth*; becauſe the Perſon of Chriſt is of a diſtinct conſideration from his Godhead and Manhood: And here they Philoſophize at large concerning the Notion of *Suppoſitum* and *Perſona* and *Hypoſtaſis*, and are glad with all their hearts

Intereſt of Reaſon &c p. 475.

hearts to find an occaſion to avoid the true Queſtion. Now I readily grant, that this was not warily expreſt, to prevent the cavilling humor of thoſe men, who have no other way to eſcape, but by taking Sanctuary in ſuch Retreats: though what I immediately add was ſufficient to inform them what I meant by it, had they any mind to underſtand it, that *they diſtinguiſh the Perſon of Chriſt as Mediator, from his Perſon as God-Man*; and cloath this Perſon with ſuch perſonal Graces, as belong neither to his Divine nor Human Nature, nor to the Union of both. Thus they talk of the Fulneſs and Riches, and Beauty and Lovelineſs, and Righteouſneſs, and Wiſdom and Power, and Grace and Mercy of Chriſt, as perſonal Graces, inherent in him, and derived immediately from his Perſon to us, whereas I made it appear by a particular examination of thoſe Scripture-phraſes, that all this is attributed to Chriſt, either with reſpect to his Doctrin, or Sacrifice, or Mediation and Interceſſion for us; that they are the effects of his ſeveral Offices, not properly the Graces of his Perſon, unleſs they will make his Mediatory Office a diſtinct Perſon: And therefore we muſt expect to receive the Commu-

Communications of his Fulneſs or Riches, or Righteouſneſs, or Grace or Wiſdom, not from a bare Union to his Perſon, but by believing and obeying his Goſpel, and in the conſcientious uſe of ſuch means as God hath appointed for the conveyance of Grace, and the Communication of all Spiritual Bleſſings to us.

Knowledg of Chriſt, p. 24. Edit. 2. p. 143. This I called *dreſſing up the Perſon of the Mediator with all thoſe Perſonal Graces and Excellencies, which may make him a fit Saviour, that thoſe who are thus united to his Perſon, need not fear miſſing of Salvation*: This

Vindicat. p. 153. the Doctor thinks prophane, becauſe *the Preparation of the Perſon of Chriſt to be a fit and meet Saviour for Sinners, which I prophanely compare to the dreſſing up of*——— (of what, good Sir? Speak out, and let us know the worſt) *is the greateſt, moſt glorious and admirable effect that ever infinite Wiſdom, Goodneſs, Power and Love wrought and produced, or will do ſo to eternity.* Very right! God's fitting Chriſt to be a meet Saviour for Sinners, was an admirable effect of Wiſdom and Power; but this new Dreſs, they have put our Saviour into, contains the greateſt Myſtery of Iniquity and Antinomianiſm, that ever was invented; and I hope it is no Prophaneneſs

phaneneſs to reprove ſuch an uncouth Metamorphoſis of our Saviours Perſon. And here once for all, I ſhall deſire my Readers to take notice of their great Artifice in perverting my Words either into Prophaneneſs or Non-ſenſe; that whatever I ſpeak againſt that odd and Phantaſtical Repreſentation which they make of the Perſon of Chriſt, they interpret as ſpoken againſt Chriſt himſelf *God-Man*; which is juſt as if a man, who argues againſt a falſe and abſurd Notion of a Deity, ſhould be charged with Atheiſm, or with Blaſphemy againſt God.

And that no man may any longer think that this *Religion of Chriſts Perſon*, as it is diſtinguiſht from *the Religion of his Goſpel*, is a peculiar Conceit and Invention of my own (as the Doctor would fain perſuade his Readers it is) I ſhall now make it appear, that this Diſtinction between the *Perſon* and *Goſpel* of our Saviour is ſo far from being imaginary, that it is the very foundation of *Antinomianiſm*.

Thus the *Antinomians* lay the foundation of their Religion *in winning and wooing People unto Chriſt*, and therefore tell us, that St. *Paul, who had an excellent faculty this way, obſerves what doth moſt effectually take*

D. *Criſp's* Chriſts Preemin. p. 89

*take with people to beguile their Spirits, and with a kind of Craft to catch their Affections, and that accordingly he meets with every thing, that is moſt enamouring and taking with people.* Thus far Dr. *Criſpe* and Dr. *Owen* very well agree in placing the great Myſtery of Religion in winning and wooing People unto Chriſt: though St. *Paul* tells us, that the Miniſters of the Goſpel *are Embaſſadors of Chriſt, beſeeching the People in Chriſts ſtead to be reconciled unto God:* So that Chriſt and his Embaſſadors woo for God, but *Antinomians* woo altogether for Chriſt, to win people to the Perſon of Chriſt.

Let us then conſider what courſe they take thus to woo and win people unto Chriſt: Now if by this *wooing people to Chriſt*, they underſtood no more than to perſuade men to embrace the Faith and Religion of Chriſt, the proper way to effect it were to prove the Truth and Certainty of the Revelation made by Chriſt, to repreſent the Excellency of his Religion, how eaſie and advantageous his Commands are, how perfective of our Nature, and how neceſſary to diſpoſe and qualifie us for future Happineſs, to ſet before them thoſe Rewards, which Chriſt hath promiſed to thoſe who obey him,

him, and those severe threatnings, which he hath denounced against the Workers of Iniquity; and to confirm them in the belief and expectation of all this, by the consideration of the Incarnation, Death, and Sufferings of the Son of God, who died to expiate our Sins, and to purchase Pardon and Eternal life for all true Penitents, and rose again from the dead and ascended into Heaven to intercede for us, to dispence the influences of his Grace, to raise us to a new and spiritual life here, and at the last Day to raise our dead bodies out of the dust, and to reward us with Immortality and Glory: And then we may argue from the love of our Crucified Saviour to perswade men to live to him, who died for them. These and such like Arguments are very powerful to perswade men to be Christians, but this is not the way *of wooing for Christ*: You must with a holy guile catch peoples affections, and make them fall in love with the Person of Christ, and therefore you must describe his Personal Graces and Excellencies, and consider what is *most enamouring and taking with the People*: Thus for instance, *The World is mightily taken with Beauty, with compleatness of Person; Oh, saith one, let me have a* Ibid.

*beautiful perſon, it is no matter how poor:* Well then, *Chriſt is a rare piece, for ſuch is the beauty of Chriſt, that there is no beauty like his: He is the Image of the inviſible God, the brightneſs of his Glory, and the expreſs Image of his Perſon:* And Mr. *Watſon* could have furniſhed him with a great many other irrefragable proofs of Chriſt's beauty and lovelineſs, though, I think, the Doctor had too much wit to have made uſe of them.

Knowledg of Chriſt, p. 115. Edit. 2. p. 77.

*But beſides Beauty, ſome perſons look for Linage, what a Stock a perſon is of: Well if this will take, then there is no Stock like this of Chriſt: he is of the greateſt Houſe in the world, The Firſt-begotten of all Creatures; He comes of that great Houſe of God himſelf. He is not a Younger Brother in this Houſe neither, for he is the Firſt-begotten of the Houſe, that is a great matter among perſons to marry the Heir of the Family; nay, he is the Only-begotten of the Houſe, there is never another in all the Family, and that is a great encouragement; ſo that if men go all the World over, to find a Match in the Noblaſt Houſe, they will never meet with ſuch a one as this of the Son of God:* which exactly agrees with Mr. *Vincent's* reaſoning to perſwade young Women to chuſe Chriſt for their Husband.

Well,

Well, but *if he be poor after all, I ſhall live but poorly with him: But Chriſt is rich in Treaſure too, it pleaſed the Father, that in him ſhould all fulneſs dwell: He hath the whole World to diſpoſe of, and therefore Gold and Silver are not to be compared to him*; which Notion Mr. *Brooks* hath excellently improved in his *Riches of Chriſt*.

Thus to conclude, *You have a Proverb, That Batchelours Wives, and Maids Children muſt be rare Creatures; that is, their fancy will deviſe what kind of one they will have, and what kinds of perfections they deſire: Let the fancy deviſe what kind of perfections it can to pleaſe ſenſe, Chriſt ſhall really out-ſtrip in perfection all theſe fancies, more than a Subſtance doth out-ſtrip a ſhadow.*

This is the great Myſtery of *Antinomianiſm* (which ſome of our Modern Divines call the Myſtery of the Goſpel, and the only ſpiritual Preaching of Chriſt) to attribute every thing immediately to the Perſon of Chriſt, which is ſpoke of him, either with reſpect to his Goſpel, and Revelations, or his Propitiation and Sacrifice, or his Mediation and Interceſſion for us, as to give ſome few inſtances of it.

Thus it is a great Goſpel truth, *That Chriſt is the way to the Father, that he is the*

*way, the truth, and the life*, both as he inſtructs us in the way to life and happineſs, how we may pleaſe God and ſave our Souls; and as he is our Mediator and High Prieſt, by whom we have acceſs to God: But then this requires, that we ſtudy his will, and live in obedience to his Laws, that we may have an intereſt in his Mediation, and may with a humble confidence put up our Prayers to God in his name: Whereas the *Antinomians*, agreeably enough with the Divinity of this laſt Age, make Chriſt ſuch a way as excludes every thing elſe, even his Laws, and Religion, Evangelical Righteouſneſs and Holineſs from being the way; Chriſt himſelf, and nothing but Chriſt, though in a ſubſervency and ſubordination to him, can be the way.

Chriſt alone exalted. Serm. 1.

Thus Dr. *Criſp* tells us, *That Chriſt is the only way to free ſinners from the guilt of ſin*; which is true in a ſober ſenſe, that Chriſt only makes attonement for our ſins, but in the Doctors Divinity Chriſt is ſo the only way, that nothing elſe but Chriſt is required to this, neither Repentance nor Evangelical Righteouſneſs. *The Goſpel holds forth the Lord Chriſt, as freely tendring himſelf to people, conſidering people only as ungodly perſons receiving him* (that is, taking him

him for their own, to be juſtified and ſaved by him) *you have no ſooner received him, but you are inſtantly juſtified by him, and in this Juſtification you are diſcharged from all the faults that can be laid to your charge.* And his Argument to prove this, is the ſame with Mr. *Ferguſon's*, *He was made ſin for us; here you ſee plainly our ſins are ſo tranſlated to Chriſt, that God doth reckon Chriſt the very Sinner; nay, God doth reckon all our ſins to be his ſins, and makes him to be ſin for us; And what is the fruit of this? We are thereby made the righteouſneſs of God in him; if we be righteouſneſs, where is our ſinfulneſs to be charged upon us?* And he adds, *Many think there is ſuch a kind of ſinfulneſs, that is a bar to them, that though they would have Chriſt, yet there is not a way open for them to take him. Beloved, there is no way of ſinfulneſs to debar thee from coming to Chriſt, if thou haſt a heart to come to him, and to venture thy ſelf with joy againſt all objections into the boſome of Chriſt to diſcharge thee of all thy ſinfulneſs.* And the Myſtery of this he immediately explains, *The truth is, men doat upon the eſtabliſhing of their own righteouſneſs to bring them to Chriſt, and it is but preſumptuous or licentious Doctrine, That Chriſt may be their truſt, and they receive him, and they conſidered ſimply ungodly as enemies.* Now one Egg is not more like

Ibid. p. 7.

P. 10.

P. 13.

Knowledg of Chriſt, p.62,65, 66,&c. p.24,129. Edit. 2. P.45,51, 90.

another, than this Doctrine is like what we find in M. *Shephard*, *Watſon*, and D. *Owen*, as evidently appears from thoſe many paſſages cited from them in my former diſcourſe.

Ibid p.49

Thus to proceed, Dr. *Criſp* obſerves, *That Chriſt is a free way to all ſorts of perſons, none excepted, none prohibited; for a Drunkard, for a Whore-maſter, for a Harlot, an enemy to Chriſt.* Or in Dr. *Owens* Phraſe, *For the greateſt, the oldeſt, the ſtubborneſt tranſgreſſour*: And what Dr. *Owen* pleads for himſelf, that he only repreſented ſuch grace in Chriſt as ſhould encourage all ſorts of perſons to come to him, will ſerve Dr. *Criſp* as well as himſelf: For he expreſly adds, *Do not miſtake me, I do not ſay, Chriſt is a free way to walk in him, and yet to continue in ſuch a condition; but for entrance into him Chriſt is as free a way for the vileſt ſort of ſinners as for any perſons under heaven*: That is, the worſt man in the world may have as good an intereſt in Chriſt for Juſtification and Eternal life as the beſt; but when Chriſt has got him, he will make him good. Of which more anon.

Ibid. p.60

*Thus Chriſt is a near way to the Father: he brings the Father unto men, and becomes ſuch a way, as that there is but one ſtep from the loweſt*

*loweſt condition of ſinfulneſs to the higheſt of being the Son of God*; That is, he who receives Chriſt, though, at that inſtant of receiving him, he be the greateſt ſinner in the world, yet in the next moment is the Son of God, and perfectly innocent and righteous with the righteouſneſs of Chriſt, and heir of eternal life.

And to take notice but of one paſſage more; *Chriſt is a ſpacious, large, elbow-room way: When a man enters into Chriſt, he enters into liberty and freedom.* But how is it ſaid then, *Srait is the gate, and narrow is the way that leadeth unto life?* Anſwer; *By the ſtraitneſs of the way is not here meant ſtrictneſs of converſation: But it is ſtrait and narrow in this regard, that all a mans own righteouſneſs muſt be cut out of the way; it muſt be ſo narrow that there muſt be nothing in the way but Chriſt*; which is exactly parallel with Dr. *Owen's chaſtity of our affections to Chriſt, in not taking any thing (as our own righteouſneſs) into our affections and eſteem for thoſe ends and purpoſes, for which we have received Chriſt*; that is, not to contribute any thing to our Juſtification or Salvation. This is the effect of making the Perſon of Chriſt in contradiſtinction from his Laws and Religion, the immediate way unto the Father.

p. 84.

Knowledge of Chriſt. p. 422. Edit. 2. p. 295.

It were eaſie to give numerous inſtances of this nature, but theſe may ſuffice to ſatisfie any intelligent man, that all thoſe precious and charming diſcourſes of the Beauty, and Lovelineſs, and Fulneſs and Riches, and Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, and of wooing and winning Souls to Chriſt, as they are managed by theſe men, are as formal hypocriſies, as *Judas* his Salutation of his Maſter when he betrayed him; for the plain deſign is to advance his Perſon to the prejudice of his Laws and Religion; whoever ſends ſinners immediately and directly to the Perſon of Chriſt for Righteouſneſs, and Juſtification, and Eternal life, without firſt requiring Repentance, and the Love of God, and at leaſt the ſincere purpoſes of a new life to entitle them to Grace and Mercy, are down-right *Antinomians*; whoever place the Eſſence of a juſtifying Faith in a meer fiducial reliance on Chriſt, and a fancifull application of Chriſts Righteouſneſs to themſelves, place all their hopes immediately on the Perſon of Chriſt, which is to make a new Religion of Chriſt's Perſon in oppoſition to his Goſpel.

But fifthly, I obſerve farther, That the Church of *England* makes Repentance, and the Love of God, and the ſincere purpoſes

purpoſes of a New life antecedently neceſſary to our Juſtification, as appears from what I have diſcourſed above; but theſe men abſolutely deny, that Repentance, or the Love of God, or any other internal Grace or Vertue, are neceſſary to our Juſtification by the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt; but that we are juſtified before and without them, at leaſt in order of nature. There are none of them indeed deny, that thoſe who are juſtified ought to live holily; but yet they aſſert, that God hath no regard to Repentance and Holineſs in the Juſtification of a ſinner, but that all theſe follow our Juſtification, as the effects and fruits of it. God juſtifies the ungodly in a proper ſenſe, while they are ungodly, but whom he juſtifies he ſanctifies too, and makes them holy.

Now if any man ſhould enquire, what great difference there is between theſe two, ſince the neceſſity of Holineſs is univerſally acknowledged; I anſwer, the difference is juſt as much as between the neceſſity of an Event, and the neceſſity of Duty, which, I think, is a very material difference in matters of Religion; to place Holineſs after Juſtification as a neceſſary effect and conſequent of it, acknow-

acknowledges the neceſſity of Holineſs, as to the Event, that thoſe who are juſtified ſhall be ſanctified; but it deſtroys the neceſſity of Duty, and undermines all the Arguments to a Holy life: God may ſanctifie us if he pleaſes, by an irreſiſtible and uncontroulable Power, but there is no neceſſary Argument left to induce us as free Agents to purifie our ſelves, and to co-operate with the Divine Grace; which makes the whole Goſpel, and all the External Miniſteries of Religion uſeleſs, the great deſign of which is to furniſh us with ſuch cogent and perſwaſive Arguments, as by the concurring aſſiſtance of the Divine Grace may effectually bow our Wills, and govern our Affections, and transform us into a Divine Nature: If we are juſtified without Repentance and a New life, if God accepts our Perſons as Juſt and Righteous only for the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt imputed to us, and this gives us an actual Title to Life and Immortality; what reaſon can there be aſſigned ſo cogent, as to conquer our love to Sin, when there is no Argument to work either upon our Hopes or Fears? The Hope of Heaven, and the Fear of Hell, are the great Motives of the Goſpel, but are of no uſe in this

this new Religion, ſince a juſtified Perſon (who yet may be very wicked) is in no danger of Hell, and is ſecure of his Inheritance in Heaven: For if a juſtified perſon may miſs of Heaven, and fall into Hell, his Juſtification is worth nothing, a man had as good be Unjuſtified, as to periſh with his Juſtification: And therefore though God, if he pleaſes, may ſanctifie whom he firſt juſtifies, yet there is no Argument left to perſwade a juſtified perſon to be holy, if he may be juſtified without it.

This I particularly ſhewed in my former Diſcourſe, where I examined Dr. *Owens* Reaſons for the neceſſity of Holineſs, which either prove nothing, or prove only the neceſſity of Event, that God will neceſſarily make men holy; not ſuch a neceſſity of Duty, as will make every conſidering man, who hath any value for his Soul, freely chuſe Holineſs. But inſtead of anſwering what I there urged, the Doctor in his * *Vindication* tranſcribes a long Paragraph concerning the neceſſity of Holineſs, and leaves it to the judgment of his Readers, which I muſt needs ſay was very boldly done, if he thought his Readers had any judgment; though it argued more craft to give me a freſh

Knowledge of Chriſt, p. 126. &c. Edit. 2. p. 88.

* p. 100.

freſh challenge, as if I had yet ſaid nothing to him.

The Doctor only takes notice of two or three things which I anſwered to his Reaſons for the neceſſity of Holineſs, and paſſes over all the reſt *as unanſwerable ſcoffing*, which is his way to call that ſcoffing, which he cannot anſwer.

Knowledg of Chriſt, p. 127. Edit. 2. p. 88.

As firſt he proved the neceſſity of Holineſs from the command of God, which had been a good Argument had it been uſed by another man; but the Doctors Notion of Juſtification by the imputed Righteouſneſs of Chriſt only, evacuates this command, and therefore I enquired, *Where is the Sanction of this Law? Will he damn thoſe, who do not obey, for their diſobedience? And will he ſave and reward thoſe who do obey for their obedience? Not a word of this, for this deſtroys our Juſtification by the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt only. And if, after all theſe Commands, God hath left it indifferent whether we obey or not, I hope ſuch Commands cannot make Obedience neceſſary.*

Vindicat. p. 120.

This laſt Clauſe the Doctor recites, and cries out, *Wonderful Divinity! A man muſt needs be well acquainted with God and himſelf, who can ſuppoſe that any of his Commands ſhall leave it indifferent whether we will obey them or no.* This I confeſs is wonderful Divinity,

nity; but I know no reaſon the Doctor ſhould wonder at it, becauſe it is his own: For ſuch indifferent things he makes all the Divine Commands, while he makes them unneceſſary to our Juſtification, which quite deſtroys their Authority, and Sanction: For a Law (if it may be ſo called) without Rewards and Puniſhments is left at the liberty of the Subject to obey it or not; and ſuch a Command cannot make Obedience neceſſary. But the Doctor proceeds, *But may we not, notwithſtanding this Command, be juſtified and ſaved without this Holineſs?* Wherein he deſigns to repreſent my Senſe, though he have changed the words, and anſwers, *falſe and impertinent, we are neither juſtified nor ſaved without them, though we are not juſtified by them, nor ſaved for them:* This is warily expreſſed, but will not ſerve his purpoſe, for by our not being juſtified without Holineſs, he means no more, than that God at the ſame time, when he juſtifies, infuſes the Habits of Grace and Holineſs, renews and ſanctifies us too, and therefore we cannot be ſaid to be juſtified without Holineſs, becauſe we are juſtified and ſanctified at the ſame inſtant, though in order of nature we are Juſtified before we are Sanctified, and

therefore

therefore in our Juſtification God had no reſpect to any ſly Antecedent Holineſs, which, as to the preſent Diſpute, is the ſame thing as to be Juſtified without Holineſs. The Doctor profeſſes it as his avowed Doctrine, *That Holineſs and Obedience is neither the Cauſe, Matter, nor Condition of our Juſtification*, and therefore not Antecedently neceſſary: And expreſly tells us, *That the Paſſive Righteouſneſs of Chriſt only is imputed to us in the non-imputation of Sin, and that on the condition of our Faith and new Obedience, ſo exalting them into the room of the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, is a thing which in Communion with the Lord Jeſus, I have as yet no acquaintance withal.* And a little before: *Are we then freed from this Obedience? Yes; But how far? From doing it in our own ſtrength, from doing it for this end, That we may obtain Life Everlaſting. It is vain, that ſome ſay confidently, that we muſt yet work for Life; it is all one as to ſay, That we are yet under the Old Covenant*, Hoc fac, & vives, *we are not freed from Obedience, as a way of walking with God, but we are as a way of working to come to him*: So that Holineſs contributes nothing to our Juſtification, and Eternal life, and therefore we may as well be juſtified and ſaved without them, which deſtroys the Neceſſity and

Communion. p. 187.

Ibid. p. 185.

and Sanction of the Divine Laws, and leaves it at every mans liberty to Obey, or not to Obey, were they not over-ruled, like ſpiritual Machines and Engines, by an irreſiſtible Power.

In the next place the Doctor proves the neceſſity of Holineſs from the Ends of God in Election and Redemption; God Elected us, and Chriſt Redeemed us, that we might be holy. This is a very good Argument too, if it be rightly managed, but that it can never be upon the Doctors Principles; that is, if we deny the Antecedent neceſſity of Holineſs to our Juſtification: For if God have abſolutely Elected us to Eternal Life without any condition required on our part, only purpoſing to make thoſe holy by an irreſiſtible Power, whom he hath Elected; this only proves the neceſſity of the Event, that thoſe who are Elected ſhall be holy, but can be no Argument to engage any man to preſs after Holineſs: For this Election to Holineſs doth not make Holineſs neceſſary on our part with the neceſſity of Duty, or of a Condition, without which we ſhall not be ſaved, but only makes it neceſſary on Gods part as to the regular execution of his Decree of Salvation. Vindicat. p. 120.

And

And the ſame may be ſaid of Redemption; if we are ſo abſolutely Redeemed by the Death of Chriſt, as to have a right to all the benefits of it as Juſtification and Eternal Life, without any condition required on our part. *If we are juſtified freely by the Grace of God, through the Redemption which is in Chriſt Jeſus*, without any regard to Repentance or New Obedience to qualifie us for this Grace, then our Redemption by Chriſt cannot make it a neceſſary Duty in us to be holy, though Holineſs may follow as a neceſſary Effect.

This I expreſſed in fewer words, but to the ſame ſenſe in my former Diſcourſe. *Will the Father Elect, and the Son Redeem none but thoſe who are holy, and reject and reprobate all others? Doth this Election and Redemption ſuppoſe holineſs in us? Or is it without any regard to it? For if we be Elected and Redeemed without any regard to our being holy, our Election and Redemption is ſecure whether we be holy or not. And ſo this cannot make Holineſs neceſſary on our parts, though it may be neceſſary on Gods part to make us holy, but that is not our care.*

This laſt Clauſe, wherein the ſtrength of the Argument lay, the Doctor omits, as not knowing what to anſwer, but as for

for the reſt, cries out, *Wonderful Divinity again.* Methinks he ſhould conſider, whoſe property it is ſo much to wonder: But what is the reaſon of this wonder? Why, *We are Elected and Redeemed with regard unto our own Holineſs, that is, Antecedently to our Election and Redemption, for Holineſs, being the Effect and Fruit of them, is that which he oppoſes:* But, pray Sir, where do I oppoſe this? Or what occaſion had I to oppoſe it in this place? My enquiry is only whether Election and Redemption include any neceſſary condition on our part, without the performance of which we cannot lay claim to the benefits of them, and whether Holineſs be that Condition; if they do not, then our Election and Redemption can be no Argument on our part to live holily, though it may be a ſufficient reaſon for God to make us holy: If they do, then indeed Election and Redemption are a very neceſſary reaſon, why we ſhould live holily, but ſuch a reaſon as the Doctor dares not own.

Another reaſon, which he aſſigned for the neceſſity of Holineſs, is, That *it is for our peace, by it we have Communion with God, wherein peace alone is to be enjoyed:* This is a very good Argument alſo in it ſelf conſidered; for if Holineſs be the only

way to enjoy peace and Communion with God, there is an abſolute neceſſity for every man, who conſults the peace of his Mind, and the ſafety of his Soul, to be holy, as God is: But this is not reconcilable with his darling Notion of Juſtification by the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt only, without any regard to our Holineſs and Obedience; for if we may be Juſtified without any reſpect to Holineſs, our Perſonal Righteouſneſs cannot be neceſſary to our peace with God, any more than it is to our Juſtification; for all juſtified perſons are in a ſtate of peace and reconciliation with God.

Knowledge of Chriſt, p. 129. Edit. 2. p. 90.

And beſides this I made it appear by two large quotations out of his Book of *Communion*, that at other times he rejected our own Righteouſneſs and Obedience, and founded our Peace with God and Communion with him wholly and entirely on Chriſt, and Juſtification by his Righteouſneſs. Here he expreſſes ſome indignation, that I would offer *to frame the appearance of a contradiction between what he ſaies on the one hand, that there is no Peace with God to be obtained by and for ſinners, but by the Atonement, that is made for them in the Blood of Jeſus Chriſt, with the Remiſſion of Sin and Juſtification by Faith, which enſue thereon; and the neceſſity*

Vindic. p. 12.

*neceſſity of Holineſs and Fruitfulneſs in Obedience to maintain in our own Souls a ſenſe of that peace with God, which we have being juſtified by Faith.*

Now though we ſhould (to bring him into a good humour again) put the Controverſie upon this Iſſue, that our Peace with God is only to be obtained by the Atonement made by Chriſt, and Juſtification by the imputation of his Righteouſneſs, but that the ſenſe of this Peace with God is owing to Holineſs and fruitfulneſs in Obedience, yet I cannot ſee how to reconcile them: For if nothing more be neceſſary to put us into a ſtate of Peace and Friendſhip with God, but the Atonement and Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, and we know, that this alone, and nothing elſe can do it; How can our own Obedience and Righteouſneſs, which we know can contribute nothing to our Peace with God, be neceſſary to give us a ſenſe, that is, the knowledge of our Peace with God? And therefore the *Antinomians* very agreeably to their own Principles, which are the very ſame with the Doctor's, do reject our own Righteouſneſs as well from being the Signs and Evidences, as the Cauſe and Matter of our Peace with God: And the Doctor

and his Friends make Sanctification ſuch a lame and imperfect Sign, that we had as good have none, as I have largely ſhewed in my former Diſcourſe.

Knowledg of Chriſt, p. 363, &c Edit. 2. p. 224.

And though we ſhould ſuppoſe Holineſs to be a very good Sign and Evidence of our Peace with God, yet this only makes Holineſs neceſſary as a Sign, not as our Duty: It may be neceſſary on our part to our preſent Comfort, not to our future Happineſs.

And yet after all the Doctors ſwaggering, I cannot underſtand that his words will bear this ſenſe: For in the firſt place he brings in a man enquiring after ſuch a Righteouſneſs, as may be a ſure foundation of hope and comfort, and may ſettle and compoſe his mind with reſpect to a future judgment, and ſhews the various ways men take in order to this: *That ſome labour to correct their Lives, amend their Ways, perform the Duties required, and ſo follow after Righteouſneſs according to the Preſcript of the Law: And in this Courſe do many men continue long with much perplexity, ſometimes hoping, oftner fearing, ſometimes ready to give quite over, ſometimes vowing to continue, (their Conſciences being no ways ſatisfied, nor Righteouſneſs in any meaſure attained) all their days.* So that here he rejects Holineſs and Obedience,

Communion p. 113.

Obedience, correcting our Lives, amending our Ways, performing Duties, from being able to give us a comfortable ſenſe of our Peace with God, this can by no means allay our Fears, and ſatisfie our Conſciences; and I think no man, who is a Chriſtian, who ever heard of Chriſts dying for our ſins, can underſtand this in any other ſenſe, than that our Holineſs and Obedience is wholly uſeleſs, not only to expiate our ſins (which every Chriſtian knows to be the work of Chriſt, and the Effect of his Death and Sufferings) but to maintain any comfortable ſenſe of the Pardon of our ſins, and the Love of God in our Souls. I am ſure he ſays the very ſame thing, and aſſigns the very ſame reaſon for it which Dr. *Criſpe* does, and therefore there is ſome cauſe to think that they were of the ſame mind.

The Reaſons Dr. *Owen* aſſigns, why there is no hope, no ſatisfaction of Conſcience in correcting our Lives, and performing Duties, are firſt, That *men have already ſinned, and therefore there is a ſcore and a reckoning upon them already, which they know not how to anſwer for by their after Obedience*: That is, their Righteouſneſs, though never ſo perfect, cannot expiate paſt Offences. *Ibid.*

Thus Dr. *Criſpe* to the ſame purpoſe tells us, *That Chriſt is he that ſaves the Soul, Chriſt is our Peace-maker*; that is, by his Expiation and Atonement. *And as Chriſt is this Peace-maker, ſo all this Peace depends upon Chriſt alone: Beloved, if you will fetch your Peace from any thing in the world but Chriſt, you will fetch it from where it is not.*

Chriſt alone exalted. p. 18.

Dr. *Owen's* ſecond Reaſon is, *That if all former Debts ſhould be blotted out, yet they are no way able for the future to fulfil the Law, they can as well move the earth with a finger as anſwer the perfection thereof.* Thus Dr. *Criſpe* in the very ſame manner; *Men forſake that peace, which is to be had in Chriſt, when they would have Peace out of Righteouſneſs of their own. Theſe are broken Ciſterns, and what Peace is there in them? Who can ſay I have waſhed my hands? If there be ſinfulneſs in them, where then is their Peace?* &c. *Fetch Peace where it is to be had, let ſubduing of Sin alone for Peace; let Chriſt have that, which is his due; it is he alone that ſpeaks Peace.*

Ibid

To the ſame purpoſe I produced another paſſage out of the Doctor's Book of Communion, where he aſſerts, *That all our wiſdom of walking with God conſiſts in our acquaintance with Chriſt*; which is not very reconcilable with what he ſays in this place, that Holineſs is neceſſary to our Peace,

Peace, and Communion, and walking with God: upon which account I had before charged him, with making Chriſt a medium of Communion and Agreement between God and bad men, while they continue ſo; to which he only anſwers according to his huffing way, that it is *flagitiouſly falſe*: Let the indifferent Reader then be judge between us: He deſcribes the diſtance between God and Men in a ſtate of nature, and how impoſſible it is they ſhould walk together: For *God is light, and in him is no darkneſs at all; we are darkneſs, and in us there is no light at all. He is Life, a living God, we are dead, dead ſinners, dead in treſpaſſes and ſins; He is Holineſs, and glorious in it, we wholly defiled, an abominable thing; He is Love, we full of hatred, hating, and being hated; ſurely this is no foundation of agreement, or upon that of walking together*: What courſe then muſt we take to come to an agreement with God, that we may walk with him? Muſt we reform our Lives, and lay aſide our Oppoſition to God, and return to our Duty and Allegeance? Not a word of this; The Doctor only directs us to Dr. *Criſpe's near way, wherein there is but one ſtep from the loweſt degree of ſinfulneſs to the higheſt of being the*

Knowledge of Chriſt. p. 55. Edit. 2. p. 38.

Vindicat. p. 70.

Communion. p. 119.

*Sons of God.* For he immediately adds, *The foundation then of this agreement is laid in Chriſt, hid in Chriſt; He, ſaith the Apoſtle, is our peace, he hath made peace for us, he ſlew the enmity in his own body on the Croſs:* So that there is nothing but Chriſt comes between men in a ſinful natural ſtate, and a holy God to make up the difference; and therefore they are in Communion with God, and in a ſtate of agreement with him by the interpoſition and mediation of Chriſt while they are wicked: And if the Doctor reply, That Chriſt, who takes away the diſtance between God and Sinners, and makes peace between them, does at the ſame time make thoſe, who were wicked, holy. Dr. *Criſpe* himſelf aſſerts as much, and yet this does not alter the caſe, for (according to this way) in order of nature they are in a ſtate of agreement with God before they are holy, and Holineſs in its own nature contributes nothing to this Agreement, but is only the Effect of it: And by the ſame reaſon, that God can be reconciled to wicked men continuing ſo for one moment, he may be ſo for ever.

But to proceed, The Doctor proves *the neceſſity of Holineſs with reſpect to Sanctification, we have in us a New Creature,* 2 Cor. 5. 17.

2 Cor. 5. 17. *This New Creature is fed, cheriſhed, nouriſhed, and kept alive by the fruits of Holineſs. To what end hath God given us new hearts, and new natures? Is it that we ſhould kill them, ſtifle the Creature, that is formed in us in the Womb? That we ſhould give him to the old man to be devoured?* To this I anſwered, *The Phraſe of this is admirable, and the reaſoning unanſwerable; for if men be new Creatures, they will certainly live new Lives, and this makes Holineſs abſolutely neceſſary by the ſame reaſon, that every thing neceſſarily is, what is, when it is; but ſtill we enquire after a neceſſary Obligation to the practice of Holineſs, and that we cannot yet diſcover.*

To this the Doctor replies, *That the new Creature, whatever I may fancy, is not a new converſation, nor a living holily, but it is the Principle and ſpiritual ability produced in Believers by the power and grace of the Holy Ghoſt, enabling them to walk in newneſs of Life, and holineſs of Converſation. And this Principle being beſtowed on us, wrought in us, for that very end, it is neceſſary for us, unleſs we will neglect and deſpiſe the Grace, which we have received, that we walk in Holineſs, and abound in the fruits of righteouſneſs, whereunto it leads and tends. Let him anſwer this if he can, and when he hath done ſo, anſwer the Apoſtle in like manner, or ſcoff not only at me, but at him*

Vindicat. p. 125.

*him alſo.* What Apoſtle the Doctor means I cannot tell, unleſs it be ſome Gnoſtick Apoſtle and Teacher of Holineſs; and I can as little gueſs, what he would have me anſwer in all this: I agree with him about the nature of the New Creature, if he only mean, that a New Creature is not made up only of External Acts of Holineſs, but is a new Principle of ſpiritual life, the Internal Habits of Grace and Vertue wrought in us by the concurring aſſiſtances of the Grace of God: but how does this make Holineſs neceſſary? Yes, ſays the Doctor, it is neceſſary we ſhould live holily, unleſs we will neglect or deſpiſe the grace of God, which was beſtowed on us for this very end; that is, unleſs we will live wickedly, which, I confeſs, is a demonſtration, we muſt live holily unleſs we live wickedly, which is the whole force of this anſwer, if it have any: For ſuppoſe we ſhould *neglect and deſpiſe the grace of God*; What then? Why, truly nothing: the neceſſity of Holineſs ceaſeth, unleſs you can ſhew ſome very great danger in doing ſo, that we ſhall loſe our Juſtification and Salvation by it; and then the neceſſity of Holineſs does not reſult from the nature of the new Creature, but

from

from the great danger of living wickedly, becauſe Holineſs is Antecedently neceſſary to obtain the Pardon of our Sins, and Eternal Life, which the Doctor dares not own.

But I would fain know what he means by neglecting or deſpiſing the Grace of God, is it to reſiſt the grace of God, and to make it ineffectual? And can the grace of God be reſiſted? Can it fail of its Effect? This is to aſſert a moral, a *Pelagian* grace, as the Doctor often tells me: If this new Creature, this new Principle of grace in us, produce the fruits of Holineſs by a free and voluntary choice, from Principles of reaſon and moral perſwaſion, together with the ſupernatural aſſiſtances of grace, then it cannot it ſelf be an argument of the neceſſity of Holineſs, but does it ſelf ſtand in need of ſuch Arguments from the neceſſity and advantages of Holineſs, as ſhall effectually incline and determine it to a conſtant and vigorous practice of Holineſs: And if this new Creature produce the fruits of Holineſs by a neceſſity of nature, meerly by the natural, or rather ſupernatural force and energy of Grace, then indeed it makes Holineſs neceſſary, as a neceſſary cauſe makes a neceſſary Effect, and the

Doctor

Doctor need not fear, that this new Creature ſhould be ſtarved for want of *being fed and cheriſhed with the fruits of Holineſs.* And indeed this is a kind of *Pelagian* fear too, that the new Creature ſhould periſh for want of being kept alive by the fruits of Righteouſneſs; for all Orthodox Divines uſe to aſſure us, that the new Creature can never die; that the leaſt ſpark of grace will live in the midſt of a whole Sea and Ocean of corruption. However upon the conſideration of the whole it appears to be an excellent Argument to prove the neceſſity of Holineſs, that we muſt abound in the fruits of Holineſs to keep the new Creature alive in us, whereas the life of the new Creature is neceſſary to produce theſe fruits of Holineſs: A Tree muſt be alive to bring forth fruit, and its bringing forth fruit is a ſign that it is alive, but the fruit it ſelf contributes nothing to the life of the Tree: Acquired Habits are owing to exerciſe, but an infuſed Principle of life in the Doctors way can neither owe its being, continuance, nor increaſe to External Acts: I am ſure in other caſes the Doctor is very much againſt *working for life.* And I can imagine no reaſon why he ſhould be for it now, but that it is

abſurd

abſurd and ſenſeleſs. And to make the moſt of this Argument that may be, the whole reſult of it is this, that we muſt live holily, that we may be holy; we muſt abound in the External fruits of Holineſs, that we may preſerve an inward Principle of Holineſs, for a new Creature in the Doctors account is no more: But if the queſtion be propoſed, what need there is of this new Creature, as well as of the fruits of it (which ought to be taken into conſideration when we enquire after the neceſſity of Holineſs, unleſs he thinks Holineſs a meer External thing) I doubt in his way he can find no good reaſon for it; unleſs he will ſay, that a new Creature is neceſſary to produce the fruits of Holineſs, and the fruits of Holineſs are neceſſary to feed and cheriſh the new Creature, and ſo they may be neceſſary for each other, but for ought yet appears might both be ſpared. I know not whether the Doctor will think all this an anſwer, but I am pretty confident (as young men are apt to be) that other men will. This is all our Author returns to thoſe Objections I made againſt his reaſons for the neceſſity of Holineſs, the reſt he paſſes over as *unanſwerable ſcoffing*; that they are unanſwerable I am verily perſwaded

perſwaded, whether they be ſcoffing, let others judge; however whether they be ſcoffing or not, any one will perceive, that in this Argument I may ſecurely ſcoff at the Doctor, without any danger of ſcoffing at any true Apoſtle.

But though the Doctor have done with me, I have not thus done with him; ſince at all turns he can talk of nothing leſs than *Apoſtles*, I ſhall acquaint the World to what Apoſtles he is neareſt related, ſuch as Dr. *Criſpe*, *Saltmarſh*, and other *Antinomian Apoſtles*, who are to the full as Orthodox in this Point as our Author, and aſſign the ſame reaſons for the neceſſity of Holineſs, and take the ſame method to ſecure the Prerogative of Chriſt, and of Free Grace: which I ſhall make appear by particular inſtances.

Dr. *Owen* pretends to be a great Friend to Holineſs, and ſo does Dr. *Criſpe*. He tells us, *That he does not ſpeak againſt Holineſs and Righteouſneſs, that becomes a people to whom Chriſt is a way, for holy and righteous they ſhall be; Chriſt will make them holy, and put his Spirit into them, to change their hearts, and work upon their Spirits.* And therefore as Dr. *Owen* takes care to aſſign the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt its proper place, and Goſpel Obedience its place, ſo does Dr. *Criſpe*.

Chriſt alone exalted. Vol. 1. p. 51.

Thus

Thus Dr. *Owen* tells us, *We do by no means aſſign the ſame place, condition, ſtate, and uſe, to the obedience of Chriſt imputed to us, and our Obedience performed to God, if we did they were really inconſiſtent.* And thus Dr. *Criſpe* aſſures us, that the conſequence of his Doctrine is not to take men off from Obedience, but *to take them off from thoſe ends which they aim at in Obedience, namely the end for which Chriſts Obedience ſerves. It doth take men off from performing duties to corrupt ends, and from the bad uſe they are apt to make of Idolizing their own Righteouſneſs. Our own Righteouſneſs is good in its kind, and for its own proper uſes, but then it proves a fruit of ſin, ignorance, and a dangerous ſtumbling block, when we go about to eſtabliſh this Righteouſneſs of ours, ſo as to bring it into the room, and ſtead, and place of Gods Righteouſneſs.* So far all is well on both ſides; let us conſider then, what thoſe ends are, for which the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt muſt ſerve, and which muſt not be attributed to our Righteouſneſs.

Vindicat. p. 101.

*Ibid.* p. 193.

p. 207.

Dr. *Owen* in the ſame place enforms us, *That thoſe who affirm, that our Obedience is the condition or cauſe of our Juſtification, do all of them deny the imputation of the Obedience of Chriſt unto us* (in his Notion, he ſhould have

have ſaid, for otherwiſe it is not true.) *The righteouſneſs of Chriſt is imputed to us, as that on the account whereof we are accepted, and eſteemed righteous before God, and are really ſo, though not inherently. Our own Obedience is not the Righteouſneſs whereupon we are accepted and juſtified before God, although it be acceptable to God, that we abound therein.* There is a *neceſſity of good Works notwithſtanding we are not ſaved by them, and that is, that God has ordained, that we ſhall walk in them.*

Ibid. p. 208. &c. And Dr. *Criſpe* ſpeaks the very ſame thing: *It will be worth the while to conſider, when our Righteouſneſs is ſaid truly to be eſtabliſhed in the room and ſtead of the Righteouſneſs of God*: viz. *When men make their own Righteouſneſs the Sanctuary and Refuge that Gods righteouſneſs only ſhould be.* As when men have ſuch imaginations as theſe, *as long as men do not mend, there is no hope that God will mend. They that put deliverance from ſin and wrath upon the ſpiritual performance of that Righteouſneſs, which the Law doth command of them, they do put that Righteouſneſs in the room and place of the Righteouſneſs of God. It is moſt true, that all the Righteouſneſs of man cannot prevail with God to do us good, there is but one mover of God, the man Chriſt Jeſus, who is the only and ſole Mediator. If you will have your own Righteouſneſs to be your Mediator with*

*with God, to ſpeak to God for you, to prevail with God for you, what is this, but to put your Righteouſneſs in the room and place of Chriſt?* Which is the very ſame with what Dr. *Owen* affirms, That our Righteouſneſs can contribute nothing to our acceptance with God. And if you will have Dr. *Criſpes* ſenſe in fewer words: It is *as much as to ſay, Our ſtanding righteous by what Chriſt hath done for us, concerns us in point of Juſtification, in point of Conſolation,, and in the buſineſs of Salvation, we have our Juſtification, we have our Peace, we have our Salvation only by the Righteouſneſs Chriſt hath done for us.* *Ibid.* p. 193. They are both you ſee agreed in attributing our Juſtification and Salvation entirely to the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt; and as for Peace and Conſolation the only difference is, that Dr. *Owen* ſometimes attributes it to Chriſt, and ſometimes to Holineſs, but Dr. *Criſpe* is always conſiſtent with himſelf and his own Principles; and yet this difference is ſo very ſmall, that Mr. *Saltmarſh* undertakes to compound it, and to allow Chriſtians of a lower form to fetch their comforts from Holineſs, as a mark and evidence, though a very uncertain one.

And now they are agreed about the place of Chriſts Righteouſneſs, they

cannot differ about the place and uſe of Obedience; for whatever does not belong to the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt may be very ſafely attributed to the Righteouſneſs of man.

Thus for inſtance, the Reaſons aſſigned by Dr. *Owen* for the neceſſity of Obedience are, Firſt, *The Soveraign Appointment and Will of God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt.* Thus Dr. *Criſpe* tells us, *That one end of our good works is a manifeſtation of our Obedience and Subjection to God,* that is our Obedience to the Soveraign will and appointment of God; and therefore he profeſſes, *I ſpeak not, Beloved, againſt the doing of any Righteouſneſs according to the will of God revealed, let that mouth be for ever ſtopped that ſhall be opened to blame the Law, that is holy, juſt, and good, or ſhall be a means to diſcourage people from walking in the Commandments of God blameleſs.*

Vindicat. p. 104.

Chriſt alone exalted. Vol. 1. p. 70.

*Ibid.* p. 210.

Dr. *Owen's* ſecond Reaſon is, *That Holineſs is one eminent and ſpecial end of the peculiar diſpenſation of Father, Son, and Spirit, in the buſineſs of exalting the glory of God in our Salvation. It is a peculiar end of God's Electing love, the Son's Redeeming love, and it is the very work of the love of the Holy Ghoſt.* To the ſame purpoſe Dr. *Criſpe* (though not ſo particularly) tells us, that the end

of

of good Works is, *The ſetting forth of the praiſe of the glory of the Grace of God*: That is, of the Grace of God in Electing, of the Grace of Chriſt in Redeeming, and of the Grace of the Holy Ghoſt in Sanctifying. *Ibid.* p. 70.

But thirdly Dr. *Owen* tells us *That Obedience is neceſſary with reſpect to the end of it, and that whether we conſider God, our Selves, or the World. Firſt, The end of Obedience with reſpect to God is his glory and honour*; So ſays Dr. *Criſpe* too, *That the end of good Works is the actual glorifying of God in the World, that our ſervices may glorifie God*, that is, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt. *Ibid.* p. 193.

Secondly, The ends aſſigned by Dr. *Owen* with reſpect *to our ſelves, are Honour, Peace, and Uſefulneſs*. The firſt of theſe I do not find Dr. *Criſpe* mention; becauſe I ſuppoſe he might think it a greater honour to be cloathed with the perfect Robes of Chriſts Righteouſneſs, than with the rags and patches of our own. The ſecond he rejects, as Dr. *Owen* ſometimes does, and ought always to do, if he would be true to his own Principles. The third he owns, but refers it to its proper head, where it ought to be placed, the end of holineſs with reſpect to others, *in doing good in the World, and being profitable to men.* P. 71.

P. 217. *That we may ſerve our Gentration, according to the Apoſtle's charge, that men ſtudy to maintain Good Works, becauſe ſaith he, theſe things are profitable unto men. There is this uſefulneſs of our Righteouſneſs, that others may receive benefit by it, Let your light ſo ſhine before men, that they ſeeing your good works may glorifie your Father which is in heaven,* which compriſeth Dr. *Owen's* ends of Conviction and Converſion, and the benefit of all, for it muſt be confeſſed, that Dr. *Criſpe* hath not ſo good a faculty, as Dr. *Owen,* in making diſtinctions without a difference. Dr. *Criſpe* indeed will by no means allow, that our own Righteouſneſs can keep off Judgments either from our ſelves, or from other men, as Dr. *Owen* would have it, but thinks, that God can be moved only by the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, and that if we muſt truſt wholly in the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt for our deliverance from future puniſhments, we may as reaſonably truſt him for preſent deliverances.

But to proceed with Dr. *Owen,* Fourthly, *Holineſs is neceſſary with reſpect to the ſtate and condition of juſtified perſons, for they have a new Creature in them, which muſt be nouriſhed and kept alive by the fruits of Holineſs.* Now though Dr. *Criſpe* was never guilty of

of talking at this abſurd rate, yet he ſays that which is more intelligible, and wherein the true force of this reaſon, if it have any, muſt conſiſt, *viz.* that Holineſs is neceſſary as it hath a neceſſary cauſe, a renewed and ſanctified nature infuſed into Believers by Chriſt. Thus he affirms, *That there is no Perſon is a Believer, and hath recieved Chriſt, but after he hath received Chriſt, he is created in this Chriſt to good works, that he ſhould walk in them. He that ſprinkleth them with clean water, that they become clean from all their filthineſs, puts alſo a new Spirit into them, and doth cauſe them to walk in his Statutes, and Teſtimonies.* Ibid. p. 69. And the Doctor honeſtly confeſſes, that the only ſecurity againſt the evil conſequences of his Doctrine is the power and efficacy of the Grace of God in bridling mens corrupt Paſſions. *That the ſame Chriſt, who hath born the wrath of the Father, and the effects thereof, the ſame Chriſt doth take as ſtrict an order to reſtrain and keep in the Spirit of a man, as to ſave that man.* p. 30. This is the true and clear way of arguing (according to theſe Principles) from the ſtate of a Juſtified perſon, becauſe ſuch a man is Sanctified too, and muſt live holily.

And fifthly, Dr. *Owen* aſſigns another reaſon of the neceſſity of Holineſs. *That*

*it is neceſſary with reſpect to the proper place of Holineſs in the New Covenant, as God hath appointed, that Holineſs ſhall be the means, the way, to Eternal life; though it be neither the cauſe, matter, nor condition of our Juſtification, yet it is the way appointed by God for us to walk in for the obtaining of Salvation.* The meaning of which is, not that Holineſs contributes any thing either to our Juſtification, or Salvation, but that God has ordained, that he will firſt ſanctifie men, before he will ſave them: This is the method God hath deſigned in the execution of his Decrees, that he will firſt juſtifie, and then ſanctifie, and then ſave and glorifie.

Now all this Dr. *Criſpe* will readily own: For he aſſerts, that Chriſt will take care to ſanctifie thoſe whom he juſtifies. And *that our Righteouſneſs is uſeful, as it is the Ordinance of God, wherein the Lord hath appointed to meet with us, and wherein he will make good thoſe things, which before he hath promiſed*; which is all that can be meant by Dr. *Owen's way*, which is neither the cauſe, nor matter, nor condition of our Juſtification, nor of our Salvation neither, as he elſewhere tells us, that we muſt not work for Everlaſting life. And therefore when Dr. *Criſpe* elſewhere tells

*Ibid.* P. 28.

tells us, *That Sanctification of life is not a jot the way of the juſtified perſon to Heaven, it is the buſineſs of a perſon that he hath to do in his way to Chriſt, but it is not the way it ſelf to Heaven.* He only means, that Holineſs is not ſuch a way as Chriſt is, but would never ſcruple to own it ſuch a way as Dr. *Owen* makes it. p. 69.

What Dr. *Owen* adds, that this Holineſs is the whole expreſſion of our thankfulneſs to God, is ſo often repeated by Dr. *Criſpe*, that I need not direct to any particular places.

From all this it evidently appears, that as great a Friend as Dr. *Owen* would ſeem to be to Holineſs, Dr. *Criſpe* is as great to the full, and that any *Antinomian* may own the neceſſity of Holineſs upon the ſame accounts that Dr. *Owen* does. Indeed the parting Line is the Antecedent neceſſity of Holineſs to our Juſtification and Salvation, and whoever will not own this, I will be bound to make it good againſt him, that he is an *Antinomian*, though he may not have courage enough openly to defend all the fulſom conſequences of that Doctrine.

And for a concluſion of this Argument I ſhall only obſerve theſe two things: Firſt, What great reaſon theſe men

have to assert a natural and irresistible efficacy of Grace in the Conversion of a Sinner. For they having taken away all those Arguments which should work upon our Hopes and Fears, which are the natural springs of action, there is nothing left, but an Omnipotent and irresistable Power, to make men good: And therefore, as I observed before, Dr. *Crisp* honestly acknowledges, *That this were the way to take the bridle from men, and make them kick up their heels, as the wild Asses upon the Mountains, were a man to be guided by himself, and to order his own way according to the pleasure of his own will*, and therefore resolves the bridling of mens Passions solely into the over-ruling power of Christ, *which restrains and keeps in their Spirits.* Which he explains by this similitude, *Although a wild Ass upon the Mountains, being loose, runs at random, yet this Ass may be taken, and so tamed, that he may be set as loose, as he was before, yet he will not run unrulily, as he did before, by virtue of that taming that is upon him. It is true, our natures themselves are mad, and if they had the reins, would run wild; but you must know, that Christ breaks this wildness, and then he dare let a Believer loose to that, in respect of which an Unbeliever, a wicked man, would take*

*Ibid.* p. 30.

*take advantage to ſin.* This is a plain confeſſion, that the only ſecurity againſt the evil conſequences of this Doctrine conſiſts in the reſtraints of Omnipotent Grace. The Doctrine is apt in it ſelf to give the reins to mens ungoverned Luſts, and Paſſions, but Chriſt ſo tames the Spirit of a man, that he ſhall not run away, though there be no bridle to keep him in; which, though it be much for the neceſſity and commendation of irreſiſtible Grace, is not much for the credit of the Chriſtian Religion.

Secondly, I obſerve alſo, what great reaſon theſe men have to cry out againſt Selfiſhneſs, or Self-love, or againſt ſerving God in hope of a Reward, or for fear of Puniſhment; becauſe they have taken away all the Objects of our Hopes and Fears; for if as Dr. *Criſpe* well ſays, *Chriſt have done all, that may be done for us, then there needs no doing at all for our ſelves.* If our Juſtification and Eternal Life be wholly owing to what Chriſt hath done for us, then we muſt not work either for Juſtification, or Eternal Life, as Dr. *Criſpe* and Dr. *Owen* both aſſert. For what reaſon then ſhall we ſerve God? *If we get nothing by all the righteouſneſs we perform, then we had as good ſit ſtill, and do nothing.* This

*Ibid.* p. 215.

This, ſays Dr. *Criſpe, is a carnal reaſoning*, and there is *Selfiſhneſs* at the botom of it; and ſuch a man had as good do nothing, for if he deſign his own good and happineſs, *he ſerves himſelf, not God, and though he doth perform Righteouſneſs never ſo exactly, if he ſerves himſelf, God will never reckon that he ſerves him.* At this rate Mr. *Shephard*, and others talk, as I ſhewed in my former Diſcourſe, and here we ſee the plain reaſon of it. For it is not imaginable, what ſhould force men into ſuch wild conceits, as to baniſh all the natural principles of Action out of Religion, but that they had firſt formed ſuch uncouth Notions of Religion, as were inconſiſtent with all the Principles of Human Nature: They firſt aſcribe our Juſtification and Salvation entirely to what Chriſt hath done and ſuffered without requiring any condition on our part, and then they were forced either to aſſert, that there was no need of ſerving God at all, which they durſt not own; or that we muſt ſerve God without deſigning any benefit and advantage to our ſelves in doing ſo, becauſe in their way there is nothing to be gained by it; and therefore unleſs we will ſerve God for nothing, we muſt not ſerve him at all: And I cannot

Knowledge of Chriſt, p. 413, &c Edit. 2. p. 295.

cannot but acknowledge, that it was very craftily done of them, to cry up that as the very hight and perfection of Chriſtianity, which (how abſurd and contradictory ſoever to the Principles of Humane Nature, yet) they were forced to own, unleſs they would renounce their darling and beloved Notions.

Thus I have given a plain and full account of the Doctrine of the Church of *England* concerning the Juſtication of a ſinner, and ſhewed what little reaſon theſe men have to talk of Articles and Homilies: All which I willingly ſubmit to the judgment of my Superiours, but neither expect nor fear an Anſwer from my Adverſaries.

---

CHAP.

## CHAP. IV.

### *Concerning an acquaintance with Chriſt's Perſon.*

THe Sum of what I charge Dr. *Owen* with in this matter is this, that, as far as I can diſcover his meaning, by an *Acquaintance with the Perſon of Chriſt*, "He "underſtands ſuch a knowledge of what "Chriſt is, hath done, and ſuffered for "us, from whence we may learn thoſe "greater, deeper, and more ſaving My-"ſteries of the Goſpel, which Chriſt "hath not expreſly revealed to us: Let us hear now how the Doctor avoids this Charge, and I ſhould be very glad, if he could come off well, for I had much rather do publick Penance in recanting an involuntary miſtake, than to find ſuch peſtilent Doctrines maintained and propagated by men of note and fame: Firſt then he tells his Readers, *That I quarrel with him about aſſerting the neceſſity of Acquaintance with the Perſon of Chriſt.* This is a very ill beginning, and I have nothing to anſwer to it, but that it is a miſtake; for

P. 16.

for I acknowledge the neceſſity of acquaintance with the Perſon of Chriſt, as much as the Doctor does, and no where intimate the leaſt diſlike of it; but *I frequently make uſe of this expreſſion afterwards by way of reproach*: That is, I often call thoſe Perſons, who derive their Schemes of Orthodoxy from a pretended acquaintance with Chriſts Perſon by the name of *Acquaintance of Chriſt*, and this I muſt confeſs is a fault, that I have given ſo good a name to them, and I wonder why they ſhould take it as a reproach: I was ſenſible that an *Acquaintance with Chriſt* was too good a name, and therefore frequently mollified it with the addition of a *pretended* acquaintance, which I ſhould never have done, had I deſigned it as a note of infamy; yet I thought it the moſt proper name to characterize thoſe men, who pretend to learn all ſaving knowledge from ſuch an acquaintance with the Perſon of Chriſt. But the Doctor adds, "That the uſe of the word Acquaintance "in this matter is warranted by our "Tranſlation of the Scripture, and that "properly, where it is required of us *to* "*acquaint our ſelves* with God: Here I perfectly agree with him, for I have no quarrel with the word *Acquaintance*, but believe *Ibid.*

it

believe it to be a very good English word, and our Translators did well to use it; nay I agree with the Doctor too, that an *acquaintance with the Person of Christ* signifies the *knowledge of Jesus Christ*, of *his Person the Word made flesh, or the Son of God incarnate*; but yet I must beg the Readers favour to believe, that this is *not the Crime*
P. 27. *I charge the Doctor with, that he asserts it necessary that Christians should know Jesus Christ*: Nor do I charge him with asserting *any acquaintance with the Person of Christ, which is not learned from the Gospel.* Nay, I do not so much as affirm, That the Doctor in expres words owns *that there are any Mysteries of Religion, that are not to be found in the Gospel, unless we are first acquainted with the Person of Christ.* I always had a better opinion of his prudence and skill in Humane Affairs than to imagine, that he would thus publickly disown the Gospel-Revelation, or set up an arbitrary Rule of Faith above it: What then is the Dispute between us? That is easily discerned by any man, who has a mind to see it, and I cannot better express it than by repeating my own words, That *by an acquaintance with the Person of Christ, he understands such a knowledge of what Christ is, hath done, and suffered for us, from whence*

we

*we may learn thoſe greater, deeper, and more ſaving myſteries of the Goſpel, which Chriſt hath not expreſly revealed to us.* This ſenſe I put upon his words, and whether I have miſtook him, the Reader has liberty to judge, when he has peruſed my Defence.

The words, on which I found this charge, and which the Doctor does very wiſely ſuppreſs, are theſe: *Chriſt is not only the wiſdom of God, but made wiſdom to us, not only by teaching us wiſdom, as he is the great Prophet of the Church, but alſo becauſe by the knowing of him, we become acquainted with the wiſdom of God, which is our wiſdom.* In which words the Doctor tells us, *That Chriſt is made wiſdom to us*; that is, that by him we learn all ſpiritual wiſdom and knowledge, all the Myſteries of Religion, theſe two ways: Firſt, As he inſtructs us in the will and wiſdom of God, as he is the great Prophet of the Church: This includes all the Revelations of the Goſpel, which the Church of Chriſt hath hitherto thought ſufficient to make a man wiſe unto Salvation; but the Doctor has diſcovered another way, whereby Chriſt is made wiſdom to us, and that is, as *by knowing of him we become acquainted with the wiſdom of God, which is our wiſdom*: So that this

this knowing of Chriſt, or being acquainted with Chriſt is a way to be acquainted with the wiſdom of God diſtinct from all the Revelations of the Goſpel: Let us then conſider, ſince we have two ways of learning wiſdom, which of theſe is the beſt, and the Doctor clearly prefers an *acquaintance with the Perſon of Chriſt* before the Revelations of the Goſpel in thoſe words which follow, *That theſe properties of God* ( his pardoning mercy, *&c*.) *Chriſt hath revealed in his Doctrine in that Revelation he hath made of God and his will, but the life of this Knowledge lies in an acquaintance with his Perſon, wherein the expreſs beams and glory of his Father doth ſhine forth*; that is, that theſe things *are clearly, eminently, and ſavingly to be diſcovered only in Jeſus Chriſt*, as he explains himſelf. Here he diſtinguiſhes again between the Revelations which Chriſt hath made, and an acquaintance with his Perſon, and prefers an acquaintance with his Perſon as the way to attain to the moſt ſaving knowledge: *The life of this knowledge lies in an acquaintance with his Perſon*, theſe things *are clearly, eminently, and ſavingly to be diſcovered only in Jeſus Chriſt*; that is, in the knowledge of his Perſon, as diſtinguiſhed from the Revelations of the Goſpel: the Goſpel

of

of Christ instructs us in the wisdom of God, but these things are discovered savingly *only* in the Person of Christ, which, if I can understand plain English, excludes the Revelations of the Gospel from making any saving discoveries of the wisdom of God: And does not all this amount to what I charge him with, that he sets up a new Rule of Faith above the Gospel, that he teaches such *a knowledge of Christ's Person, from whence we may learn those greater, deeper, and more saving Mysteries of the Gospel, wich Christ hath not expresly revealed to us*; for if Christ hath *expresly revealed* these things to us, I can by no means understand, why they may not be as *clearly, eminently, savingly discovered* in the Revelations of the Gospel, as in the Person of Christ.

Now though no man in his wits will openly profess to learn any other new Mysteries from the Person of Christ, than what are revealed in the Gospel, yet when men have set up a new Rule of Faith or Knowledge, they may learn new discoveries too, if they please; especially if it be such a rule, as will bend and comply with every mans fancy; and thus it hath fared with the Doctor and his Friends, as I have made appear by a whole Scheme of

new Divinity, which is wholly owing to this acquaintance with the Perſon of Chriſt, but hath no ſolid foundation in the Goſpel.

But though the Doctors words be too plain and expreſs to be evaded, yet I had a ſurer foundation for this Charge than ſome looſe or unwary expreſſions; for the deſign of that whole digreſſion *of the excellency of Chriſt Jeſus* will ſatisfie any impartial Reader, that I did not either miſtake or pervert his ſenſe; for there he gives us many examples of this way of reaſoning from the knowledge of Chriſts Perſon to diſcover thoſe other great Myſteries of Religion, which however they may be revealed in the Goſpel of Chriſt, yet *are clearly, eminently, ſavingly diſcovevered only in Jeſus Chriſt.* He reduces the ſum of all true wiſdom to three heads, the knowledge of God, and of our ſelves, and skill to walk in Communion with God; and adds, *That not any of them is to any purpoſe to be obtained, or is manifeſted, but only in and by the Lord Chriſt.* "Upon this I
p. 41. Edit. 2. p. 29. "obſerved in my former Diſcourſe, that "*by* is fallaciouſly added to include the "Revelations Chriſt hath made, where- "as his firſt undertaking was to ſhew, "how impoſſible it is to underſtand theſe

"things

"things *savingly* and *clearly*, notwith-
"standing all those Revelations God
"hath made of himself and his will by
"*Moses* and the Prophets, and by Christ
"himself, without an acquaintance with
"his Person.

To this the Doctor answers, *The fallacy pretended is meerly of his own coyning. The knowledge I mean is to be learned in Christ, neither is any thing to be learned in him, but what is learned by him. I do say indeed now, whatever I have said before, that it is impossible to understand any sacred truth savingly and clearly without the knowledge of the Person of Christ; but that in my so saying I exclude the consideration of the Revelations, which Christ hath made, or that God hath made of himself by* Moses *and the Prophets and Christ himself, the principal whereof concerns his Person, and whence alone we come to know him, is an assertion becoming the modesty and ingenuity of this Author.* As for modesty and ingenuity, the Doctor may take them to himself, since no man deserves them better, but I would willingly put in for a share of truth and honesty, if he can spare any: The Doctor says the fallacy is of my own coyning, pray why so? Because he does not exclude the Revelations which Christ hath made; nor do I say he does p. 36.

in these words, but the fallacy consists in not doing it, which he ought to have done, if he would have been true to his proposed design: He who undertakes to prove, that there are any sacred truths, which cannot be *clearly and savingly* known by the Revelations of the Gospel without an acquaintance with the Person of Christ, (which was the Doctors task, as appears from what I have already said) though he need not wholly renounce Revelation, yet he ought to consider the Revelations of Christ, and the knowledge of his Person distinctly, and shew that these truths are not clearly manifested by Revelation, but are clearly and savingly discovered in the Person of Christ: The first of these (especially with reference to some new discoveries) the Doctor has done pretty honestly, for he has either alleadged no Scriptures for the proof of these grand Doctrines, or such, as every one may easily see, do not clearly prove them; I shall now consider how he acquits himself in the second, whereby it will evidently appear, that he sets up the knowledge of Christs Person as a way of learning Divine Truths distinct from the Revelations of the Gospel: A few instances will be sufficient to clear this matter;

ter; and that is all I at preſent deſign.

I ſhall begin with that terrible diſcovery *of the naturalneſs of Gods righteouſneſs (vindictive juſtice) unto him, in that it was impoſſible, that it ſhould be diverted from ſinners without the interpoſing of a Propitiation*; this the Doctor tells us is diſcovered in Chriſt, that is, in his Death and Sufferings for Sin; what he means by a natural vindictive juſtice I ſhall conſider in its proper place, my preſent buſineſs is to examine, how he proves a natural vindictive juſtice in God from the knowledge of Chriſt, and the only Argument in that place is this: *Thoſe who lay the neceſſity of ſatisfaction meerly upon the account of a free act and determination of the will of God, leave to my apprehenſion no juſt and indiſpenſable foundation for the Death of Chriſt, but lay it upon a ſuppoſition of that which might have been otherwiſe; but plainly God in that he ſpared not his only Son, but made his ſoul an Offering for Sin, and would admit of no Atonement but in his bloud, hath abundantly manifeſted, that it is of neceſſity to him (his Holineſs and Righteouſneſs requiring it) to render indignation, wrath, tribulation, and anguiſh unto Sin. To look upon it (Vindictive Juſtice) as that which God may exerciſe or forbear,* Of the excellency of Chriſt. p. 93.

*makes his Juſtice not a property of his Nature, but a free act of his Will: And a will to puniſh, where one may do otherwiſe without injuſtice, is rather ill will, than juſtice.* If you reſolve this Argument into its ſeveral Propoſitions, it muſt proceed thus: It is very plain in Scripture, that Chriſt died for our ſins; ſo far Revelation goes. Hence the Doctor infers, That it was abſolutely neceſſary, that Chriſt ſhould die for our ſins; from hence he infers, That it was abſolutely neceſſary, that Sin ſhould be puniſhed; and thence he infers, That Punitive and Vindictive Juſtice is ſo abſolutely neceſſary to God, that it is not at the free choice of his Will, whether he will puniſh ſin, or not, but he muſt do it: Now whether this Argument be good or bad, I am not at preſent concerned to enquire, but ſhall only ask, whence the Doctor learns all this train of Conſequences, from which he at laſt concludes, the naturalneſs and neceſſity of God's Vindictive Juſtice? Are we any where told in Scripture, that becauſe Chriſt died for ſin, therefore it was abſolutely neceſſary he ſhould die for Sin; and that it was abſolutely neceſſary he ſhould die for Sin, becauſe it is abſolutely neceſſary that Sin ſhould be puniſhed, and that it is

abſolute-

abſolutely neceſſary that Sin ſhould be puniſhed, becauſe God is ſo naturally juſt and righteous, that he cannot do otherwiſe: If we are no where taught in Scripture to argue at this rate, then here is a plain example how we may learn ſomething from the knowledge of Chriſt's Perſon, which the Goſpel has not expreſly taught us; how we may reaſon from what Chriſt hath done and ſuffered to draw ſuch Concluſions, as are either no where to be found in expreſs terms in Scripture, or at leaſt which we are no where taught to draw from ſuch Premiſes; which makes an Acquaintance with the Perſon of Chriſt a new way of diſcovering Divine Truths diſtinct from the Revelations of the Goſpel; and if this be once acknowledged to be a good way of reaſoning, men may as well draw ſuch Concluſions, as are no where to be found in Scripture, as thoſe which are.

By the ſame Argument the Doctor proves what the deſert of Sin is: *the demerit of Sin is ſuch, that it is altogether impoſſible that God ſhould paſs by any, the leaſt, unpuniſhed:* How does this appear? Why from the Perſon, who ſuffered for it, who was the only Son of God, *and if God would have done it for any* (paſſed by ſin unpuniſhed) *he*

*would have done it in reference to his only Son, but he ſpared him not.* The ſum of which Argument is this, that becauſe God would not ſpare his only Son, after he had determined, that he ſhould die as a Sacrifice for ſin, therefore he could not ſpare him, and therefore the demerit of Sin is ſuch, that it is impoſſible God ſhould ſuffer it to go unpuniſhed, which is indeed a pretty Argument, but whether it be true or falſe, it is no Scripture Argument, and therefore may ſerve for another inſtance of this new way of reaſoning from the knowledge of Chriſt.

This may ſuffice at preſent to make good my Charge, that the Doctor ſets up an acquaintance with the Perſon of Chriſt as a new medium of ſaving knowledge, diſtinct from the Revelations of the Goſpel; from whence we may clearly and ſavingly learn thoſe Divine Truths, which though they are pretended to be contained in the Goſpel, yet are not clearly and ſavingly to be learnt thence without this knowledge of the Perſon of Chriſt; the plain meaning of which is, that men muſt firſt reaſon from what Chriſt hath done and ſuffered, and thence form their Notions and Theories of Religion, and then it is very hard, if they cannot find ſome obſcure, ambiguous, or metaphorical

rical expreſſions in Scripture to countenance ſuch conceits.

But this Book of *Communion*, out of which I have tranſcribed theſe paſſages, was writ near twenty years ſince, and therefore to do the Doctor all the right we can, let us conſider whether in his later Writings he hath expreſſed himſelf more cautiouſly in this matter.

In his ſecond Volume on the *Hebrews*, a Book of a very late date, *p.*20. I find this obſervation: *A diligent attentive conſideration of the Perſon, Offices, and Work of Jeſus Chriſt is the moſt effectual means to free the Souls of men from all entanglements of errors, and darkneſs, and to keep them conſtant in the profeſſion of the truth*: This is the very ſame Doctrine we had before, that we muſt learn Divine Truths (which is much the ſame with being delivered from errors and darkneſs) by a knowledge of the Perſon and Offices of Chriſt: For the explaining of this he tells us there muſt be *a diligent ſearching into the Word, wherein Chriſt is revealed to us: The Scriptures reveal him, declare him, teſtifie of him, to this end are they to be ſearched, that we may learn and know what they ſo declare and teſtifie.* Thus far it is very well, and would men confine their knowledge of Chriſt and Divine Truths

Truths to the Revelation of the Gospel, it would be an infallible preservative against all Error: But I do not so well understand what he adds towards the conclusion of that Discourse: *Unto him* (Christ) *and the knowledge of him is all our study of the Scripture to be referred, and the reason why some in the perusal of it, have no more light, profit, or advantage, is, because they have no more respect unto Christ in their enquiry. If he be once out of our eye in searching the Scripture, we know not what we do, nor whither we go, no more than doth the Mariner at Sea without regard to the Pole-star. Truths to be believed are like Believers themselves, all their life, power, and order, consist in their relation to Christ, separated from him they are dead and useless.* This is very profound and Mysterious; we must search the Scriptures to know Christ, and the knowledge of Christ must direct us in expounding the Scripture, as the Pole-star does the Mariner to steer a safe and direct Course: We must consider all Truths in their relation to Christ, which gives life, and power, and order to them. I wish the Doctor had given us some examples of this, for I confess, I cannot understand it. In p. 23. he tells us, *But here lies the root of mens failings in this matter: They seek*

*for*

*for truth of themſelves, and of other men, but not of Chriſt, what they can find out by their own endeavours, what other men inſtruct them in, or impoſe upon them, that they receive; few have that faith, love, and humility, are given up to that diligent contemplation of the Lord Chriſt, and his Excellencies, which are required in thoſe, who diligently wait for his Law, ſo as to learn the truth of him*: So that it ſeems by eying Jeſus Chriſt in ſearching the Scriptures, he means a diligent contemplation of the Lord Chriſt and his Excellencies, which will be a ſafer guide to all true ſaving knowledge than all other enquiries whatſoever; ſo that ſtill we muſt learn all Sacred Truths from the knowledge of Chriſt's Perſon and Excellencies. And indeed this he expreſly tells us in the ſame Page, "*All the treaſures of* "*wiſdom and knowledge are hid in Chriſt*, and "therefore from him alone to be re- "ceived, and in him alone to be learned: "In the due conſideration of the Lord "Chriſt are theſe Treaſures opened unto "us. There is not the leaſt line of truth, "how far ſoever it may be extended, and "how ſmall ſoever it may at length ap- "pear, *but the ſprings of it lie in the Perſon* "*of Chriſt*; and then we learn it aright, "when we learn it in the ſpring, or *as it*

"*is*

"*is in him*, Eph. 4. 21. which when we "have done, we may ſafely trace it "down, and follow it to its utmoſt ex- "tent. If there be any ſenſe to be made of this Diſcourſe, it muſt be this, that we muſt learn all Divine Truths from a conſideration of the Lord Chriſt, his Perſon and Excellencies, *&c.* becauſe the Springs of all truth lie in the Perſon of Chriſt, and without ſuch a ſerious conſideration of the Perſon of Chriſt to direct and ſteer our Courſe, the ſtudy of the Goſpel will avail us nothing: That it is to no great purpoſe to underſtand Goſpel Truths, unleſs we can find out the ſprings, and the Center of them in the Perſon of Chriſt: *He that looks upon Goſpel-truths as* Sporades, *as ſcattered up and down independently one of another, who ſees not the Root, Center, and Knot of them in Jeſus Chriſt, it is moſt probable, that when he goes about to gather them for his uſe, he will alſo take up things quite of another nature.*

But it may be we may underſtand the Doctor better, if we conſider the object of this conſideration, which is to free men from all errors and darkneſs, and
*Ibid.* that is, *the Perſon of Chriſt, his Offices, and his work*; this is the very thing I charged him with, that he affirmed, we muſt attain

attain to a ſaving knowledge of Divine Truths from a conſideration of the Perſon of Chriſt, and what he had done and ſuffered for us, ſo that I hope every one will now believe, that this was no Calumny.

From Chriſts Authrority as King he obſerves, p. 22. *Men not conſidering the Authority of Chriſt, either as inſtituting the Ordinances of the Goſpel, or as judging upon their neglect or abuſe, are careleſs about them, or do not acquieſce in his pleaſure in them: This hath proved the ruine of many Churches, who neglecting the Authority of Chriſt, have ſubſtituted their own in the room thereof: The conſideration therefore of this Kingly Legiſlative Authority of the Lord Chriſt by men, as to their preſent duty and future account, muſt needs be an effectual means to preſerve them in the truth, and from backſlidings.* From the faithfulneſs of Chriſt as Prophet, he obſerves the ſame thing: *He being then ultimately to reveal the will of God, and being abſolutely faithful in his ſo doing, is to be attended unto: Men may thence learn, what they have to do in the Church and Worſhip of God, even to obſerve and to do whatever he hath commanded, and nothing elſe.* This is the very firſt Principle of Phanaticiſm, which undermines the moſt prudent Orders and wholſom

wholſom Conſtitutions of any Church, and is another inſtance of this way of Reaſoning from the knowledge of Chriſt to diſcover thoſe important Truths, which the Goſpel no where expreſly teaches: Neither Chriſt nor his Apoſtles have any where told us, that we muſt do nothing in the Worſhip of God, but what Chriſt hath expreſly commanded, but this we muſt learn from an acquaintance with the Perſon and Offices of Chriſt, from his Authority as King, and Faithfulneſs as Prophet, which (if we will believe the Doctor) have left no room for the exerciſe of Humane Authority, nor for the uſe of humane Prudence in Church-Affairs.

But all this the Doctor ſpake without an Adverſary, let us now conſider, how he explains his own meaning in his Anſwer to my Diſcourſe, which you may find in pag. 33, 34. where he firſt denies,

Vindicat. P. 33, 34. *That he ever taught any other knowledge of Chriſt, or acquaintance with his Perſon, but what is revealed and declared in the Goſpel.* This (as I obſerved above) I never charged him with, and he himſelf ſeems to be ſenſible of it, and therefore adds; *Yet I will mind this Author of that, whereof if he be ignorant, he is unfit to be a Teacher of others,*

and

*and which if he deny, he is unworthy the name of a Chriſtian,* (this is a dangerous Dilemma; for I confeſs, I am not at preſent diſpoſed either to part with my *Rectorſhip*, or my *Chriſtianity*, and therefore let us hear what it is) *namely, that by the knowledge of the Perſon of Chriſt, the great Myſtery of God manifeſt in the fleſh, as revealed and declared in the Goſpel, we are led into a clear and full underſtanding of many other Myſteries of Grace and Truth, which are all Centred in his Perſon, and without which we can have no true nor ſound underſtanding of them: I ſhall ſpeak it yet again, that this Author if it be poſſible may underſtand it,* (this is kindly done, ſince ſo much lies at ſtake on it) *or however that he and his Co-partners in deſign may know, that I neither am, nor ever will be aſhamed of it: That without the knowledge of the Perſon of Chriſt, which is our acquaintance with him, as we are commanded to acquaint our ſelves with God, as he is the Eternal Son of God Incarnate, the Mediator between God and Man, with the Myſtery of the Love, Grace, and Truth of God therein, as revealed and declared in the Scripture, there is no true uſeful ſaving knowledge of any other Myſteries or Truths of the Goſpel to be attained.* I wiſh I get well off, but I will do my beſt endeavour to underſtand it. *By the knowledge*

*ledge of the Perſon of Chriſt, the great Myſtery of God manifeſted in the fleſh, as revealed and declared in the Goſpel, we are led into a clear and full underſtaneing of many other Myſteries of Grace and Truth, which are Centred in his Perſon, and without which we can have no true nor ſound underſtanding of them.* If by this he means, that we cannot underſtand thoſe myſteries of Grace and Truth, which concern the Perſon of Chriſt without knowing the Perſon of Chriſt, this is a great Truth, but contains no great Myſtery: As for inſtance, Unleſs we have ſome knowledge of the Perſon of Chriſt, God manifeſted in the fleſh, we cannot underſtand the love of God in ſending Chriſt into the World, nor the great Myſtery of Pardon and Forgiveneſs through the bloud of Chriſt, we can know nothing of his Death, and Reſurrection, and Aſcenſion into Heaven, and Interceſſion for us at the right hand of God, and all thoſe benefits we receive from it; we cannot underſtand our Adoption in Chriſt to be the Children of God, nor our Union and Relation to him as our Head and Husband, as our Lord and Saviour, nor the communications of his Grace and Virtue to us, nor his Power and Authority to raiſe us from the Dead,

to

to judge the World, and to beſtow Life and Immortality upon his obedient Diſciples: Not that the *Springs of theſe Truths lie in the Perſon of Chriſt*, or muſt be learnt from a contemplation of his Perſon, but from the Revelations of the Goſpel. But the knowledge of Chriſt's Perſon is neceſſary in order to underſtand thoſe other Goſpel Myſteries, for the ſame reaſon, that it is neceſſary to underſtand, that there was ſuch a man as *Alexander*, before you can know what he did, where he was King, what Battels he fought, what Victories he won; or by the ſame reaſon, that you muſt firſt know the ſubject, before you can know the properties, and qualifications of it. If this be all the Doctor intends, I muſt confeſs it is very ſound and Orthodox, but yet I muſt ſay, that time was, when he meant otherwiſe, and his obſcure way of expreſſing ſo plain a thing would make any one ſuſpect, that he meant ſomething more ſtill; and if he does, then after all his ſoft and palliating expreſſions, it muſt come to this, That the Perſon of Chriſt is the Spring and Fountain of all ſaving Knowledge, from whence we muſt learn all thoſe Myſteries, which are but obſcurely and imperfectly revealed in the

Goſpel, unleſs we make uſe of this knowledge of Chriſt and acquaintance with his Perſon to expound and unriddle them: And indeed his ſecond Explication of his ſenſe in this matter plainly looks this way: For under an *acquaintance with Chriſt* he includes the knowledge of him, *as the Eternal Son of God incarnate, the Mediator between God and Man, with the Myſtery of the Love, Grace, and Truth of God therein, as revealed and declared in the Scripture.* This comprehends all thoſe Revelations, which immediately concern the Perſon of Chriſt, as his Nature, Offices, Mediation, and all the benefits which flow from them, *the Myſtery of the Love, Grace, and Truth of God therein*; And then he adds, That without ſuch a knowledge of the Perſon of Chriſt as this (which contains all we can know, and all that is revealed in the Goſpel concerning Chriſt) *There is no true uſeful ſaving knowledge of any other Myſteries of the Goſpel to be attained.* This indeed is very warily ſaid, and like a right Sophiſter; ſet aſide all the ſaving Myſteries of the Goſpel, which concern the Perſon, and Offices, and Mediation of Chriſt, and then there are no other ſaving Myſteries to be diſcovered, or at leaſt no ſaving knowledge of any other Myſteries, becauſe

becauſe he knew very well, that no Chriſtian could own any ſaving knowledge, when he had laid aſide the knowledge of Chriſt: And yet in this ſaying he craftily inſinuates too, that there are ſome other ſaving Myſteries, which are to be diſcovered, when we are firſt acquainted with Chriſt; and he ſhould have done well to have told me what they are, and how they may be diſcovered, ſince my Living or my Chriſtianity lay at ſtake, and I am not very good at gueſſing; but ſince he has here concealed this ſecret, we muſt learn what it is from his former Writings, and then whatever danger there be in it, I muſt needs ſay, that this acquaintance with the Perſon of Chriſt is a very ill way of expounding Scripture, or of learning Goſpel-Myſteries, as being that, which different men may uſe to different purpoſes (as I ſhewed in my former Diſcourſe) and from whence ſome men draw ſuch Concluſions, as do quite evacuate the ends and deſign of the Goſpel.

This is ſufficient to vindicate my ſelf from thoſe imputations of Falſhood and Calumny, which occur almoſt in every Page of the Doctors Anſwer, but I ſhall not diſmiſs this ſubject thus, but ſhall

firſt ſhew you, that there is ſuch a way of reaſoning from the knowledge of Chriſt's Perſon now in great vogue among ſome late Writers, and what Arguments I reject upon that ſcore, as weak or fallacious: And ſecondly, diſcourſe ſomething more particularly concerning this way of reaſoning.

As for the firſt, I have given inſtances enough of this nature in my former Diſcourſe, which were ſo plain and evident, that I thought the bare mentioning of them was ſufficient to convince any man from what Principles ſuch Arguments and Concluſions were deduced. But becauſe I find, that my Adverſaries are willing to take no notice of the chief deſign for which thoſe paſſages were alleadged, but to fall into ſome collateral Diſputes, I muſt be forced more expreſly to ſtate the matter in debate, and reduce it to another form and method.

The Queſtion then between us is plainly this, Whether any Perſons pretend to learn or prove the great Principles of their Religion from an Acquaintance with the Nature, Perſon, Offices of Chriſt, diſtinct from the Revelations of the Goſpel. In my former Diſcourſe I aſſerted, that they deduced ſuch Doctrines from the knowledge

knowledge of Chriſt, as are no where expreſly contained in Scripture, and I doubt not, but that will appear true, upon a particular examination of ſuch Doctrines as they have or ſhall fall in my way: but let the Doctrines be true or falſe, the preſent diſpute is, whether they make the knowledge of Chriſts Perſon a new medium of ſaving knowledge, from whence we may learn the greater, deeper, and more ſaving Myſteries of Religion, diſtinct from the Revelations of the Goſpel: And that they do ſo is plain from this, that moſt of the Arguments, from whence they deduce, and by which they prove their moſt darling and myſterious Notions, are wholly owing to an acquaintance with Chriſts Perſon, and are no where expreſt in Scripture. I have already given two inſtances of this in his way of proving *the naturalneſs of vindictive juſtice to God, and the deſert and demerit of ſin*, and ſhall now add ſome more.

The Doctor proves from the Deity of Chriſt (as I obſerved in my former Diſcourſe) *the endleſs, bottomleſs, boundleſs grace and compaſſion that is in him, mercy enough for the greateſt, the eldeſt, the ſtubborneſt tranſgreſſor, the infiniteneſs of Grace with reſpect to the Spring or Fountain* (the p. 206.

Deity of Chriſt) *will anſwer all our Objections. What is our finite guilt before it?* (How comes this guilt to be finite now? When we are ſo often told, that the demerit of every ſin is infinite, as being committed againſt an infinite God, and requiring an infinite ſatisfaction for its Atonement) *Shew me the Sinner, that can ſpread his iniquity to the dimenſions (if I may ſo ſay) of this Grace.* I am glad to hear the Doctor put ſo fair a ſenſe on theſe words, and to declare to the World, that he deſigned no
P.170. more in it, *than to invite all ſorts of ſinners, though under the moſt diſcouraging qualifications, to come unto Chriſt for Grace and Mercy by Faith and Repentance:* Though any man, who reads that long Diſcourſe about an endleſs, bottomleſs, boundleſs Grace and Compaſſion in Chriſt, ſuch an infinite Grace as makes nothing of our finite guilt, as all the ſins in the world cannot equal its dimenſions, without one word of Faith or Repentance, or a new life to qualifie us for this mercy, eſpecially if withal he underſtood what a great Patron the Doctor is of the neceſſity of holineſs and obedience to qualifie us for Gods mercy (as appears from what I have already diſcourſed above) would not eaſily have gueſſed this to have been his meaning:

meaning: And whoever writes a Book which cannot be underſtood without a Commentary, ought not to complain that he is miſtaken, nor charge his Readers upon that account with ignorance, falſhood, or calumny: Though for my part I ſhall be very well contented he ſhould write another Book conſiſting of little elſe than thoſe mild and gentle imputations of falſhood and calumny, ſo he will but recant, or at leaſt handſomly palliate thoſe doctrines, which otherwiſe may encourage bad men continuing ſo, to lay claim to ſuch a boundleſs and bottomleſs mercy.

But my preſent buſineſs is to obſerve, how the Doctor proves, that there is ſuch *a boundleſs, bottomleſs Grace in Chriſt*, and his Argument is taken from his Divine Nature, which is infinite: For *when the Conduit of his humanity is inſeparably united to the infinite inexhauſted fountain of the Deity, who can look into the depths thereof; if now there be Grace enough for ſinners in an all-ſufficient God, it is in Chriſt.* This is a plain inſtance of this way of reaſoning from an acquaintance with Chriſt, (with his Divine nature) which the Scripture no where teaches, and which is weak and fallacious: For though the Divine Na-

ture be infinite, yet the exercise of mercy and compassion is regulated by wisdom, and the free choise of the Divine Will, and therefore though we may conclude from the Divine Nature, that God will be gracious and compassionate to sinners, yet we cannot certainly know in what measures and proportions God will exercise this Grace and Mercy without an express declaration of his Will; and when God has declared his Will, as he has now done in the Gospel, it is then at best to no purpose to argue from his Nature, unless we have a mind to encourage Sinners to expect more Grace from the Divine Nature than God hath promised in the Revelation of the Gospel.

So that though we should suppose, *that*
p. 272. *he did not consider this boundless Grace in Christ as Mediator, but considered it as in him who is Mediator* (which by the way spoils all the comfort sinners might take from the boundless mercy of the Divine Nature in Christ, if this be not in him as our Mediator, unless we may expect more Grace from Christ upon his Personal account, than from his Mediation, that is, more from the Person than from the Gospel of Christ, which contains the terms of his Mediation, which he so vehemently

vehemently diſowns) yet I ſay this Argument were weak and fallacious, becauſe we cannot reaſon thus from the Divine Nature it ſelf, for though the Divine Nature be the Fountain of Grace and Mercy, yet the Divine Will regulates the exerciſe of it, and aſſigns its meaſures; much leſs can we reaſon thus from the Divine Nature conſidered in Chriſt as our Mediator; for a Mediator as Mediator, though he be *God-man*, is not the Fountain, but Miniſter of Grace, as Chriſt witneſſes, *That he came not to do his own will, but the will of him that ſent him.* And thus he is conſidered in Scripture, even where he is ſaid to be *the only begotten of the Father, full of Grace and truth*, which ſeems not primarily to refer to the inherent glory and perfection of his Nature (though that may be proved from it) but to the glory of his Miniſtry, which was the only glory the Apoſtles could then diſcover, when his Eſſential Majeſty was hid under a vail of fleſh: and therefore I think ſtill, the Doctor would do well to make *God the Father the Fountain of Grace*, for though when we conſider the three Perſons in the Sacred Trinity in the Unity of the Divine Eſſence, what is attributed to one is ſuppoſed to be attributed to the other; yet

when

when we conſider them under different capacities and relations, it is not ſo: Chriſt as God eſſentially one with the Father and Holy Spirit is the Fountain of Grace, as Mediator he is the Miniſter of it; the Father ſends, and Chriſt is ſent; the Father preſcribes his work, and he finiſhes it: And therefore to make Chriſt *as Mediator*, the Fountain of Grace is a derogation from God the Father, whom the Scripture makes the firſt mover and ſupreme Agent in the work of our Redemption.

p. 209. I obſerved in the ſame place another inſtance of this way of reaſoning from the Divine Nature in Chriſt, to prove that Eternity, Unchangeableneſs, and Fruitfulneſs of his Love. Now this, I ſay, is a way of proving the Eternity, Unchangeableneſs, and Fruitfulneſs of Chriſt's love, which the Scripture no where teaches, but is wholly owing to an acquaintance with Chriſt: And I wonder that the Doctor ſhould be at a loſs to know what it is I except againſt, whether it be, *that the love of Chriſt, as he is God is Eternal? Or that it is Unchangeable? Or that it is Fruitful, or Effective of good things unto the Perſons Beloved?* It is neither of theſe in themſelves conſidered, for I own all,

Vindicat. p. 177.

as

as he very well knows, but I except partly againſt his way of ſtating theſe things, and partly againſt his way of proving them: or rather againſt both together. What he means by this Eternal, Unchangeable and Fruitful Love, he tells us himſelf: *The love which I intend, and whereunto I aſcribe thoſe properties is the eſpecial love of God in Chriſt unto the Elect.* This is ſuch a love, as is Eternal without beginning, and without end, as does not change with the changes of the object, as the love of men does, and *is ſo fruitful and effectual, as to love Life, Grace, holineſs into us, to love us into Covenant, to love us into heaven.* Now my buſineſs is not to diſpute the caſe, whether God have elected ſome particular Perſons, whom he will infallibly bring to glory, which I never denied yet, and I think never ſhall: But the queſtion is, Whether the Eternity, and Unchangeableneſs, and fruitfulneſs, of this Electing Love, can be proved from the Eternity, and Immutability, *&c.* of the Divine Nature: The inconvenience I then urged it with was this, *If this love be ſo Eternal and Unchangeable,* &c. *becauſe the Divine Nature is ſo, then it was always ſo, for God always was what he is, and that which is Eternal could never be other than it is now;* Vindicat. p. 183. p. 210.

*and*

*and why could not this Eternal, and Unchangeable, and Fruitful love as well preſerve us from falling into Sin, and Miſery, and Death, as love Life and Holineſs into us all.* To this the Doctor anſwers, "That Gods love is in "Scripture repreſented Unchangeable, be- "cauſe he himſelf is ſo, but it doth not "hence follow, that God loveth any one "naturally or neceſſarily. His love is a "free act of his Will, and therefore "though it be like himſelf, ſuch as be- "comes his nature, yet it is not neceſſa- "rily determined on any object, nor limi- "ted as to the Nature, Degrees, Effects "of it, which he proves from the diffe- rent diſpenſations of the Grace and Mer- cy of God under the Law and Goſpel; and adds, "God is always the ſame that "he was, love in God is always the ſame "that it was; but the Objects, Acts, and "Effects of this Love, with the meaſures "and degrees of them, are the iſſues of "the counſel or free purpoſe of his Will. Now this Anſwer is what I would have, and plainly diſcovers the Sophiſtry of this way of reaſoning: For if this electing Love be not the immediate and neceſſary effect of the Divine Nature, but the free choiſe and purpoſe of his Will, then we cannot learn either that it is, or what it is from

from the bare contemplation of the Divine Nature, but from the declarations of the Divine Will; for we can prove nothing from the Divine Nature, but what has a neceſſary and inſeparable connexion with ſome attribute and perfection in God; but where a free choice and counſel intervenes, we muſt be contented to be ignorant, or to learn from Revelation.

We may certainly conclude from the holineſs and goodneſs of God, that God will love good men, and hate the wicked, becauſe holineſs includes in the very notion of it a neceſſary love to goodneſs, and hatred of evil; and from the immutability of God, we may conclude his unchangeable love to goodneſs, and hatred of evil, as the Pſalmiſt expreſſeth it, *Pſal.* 103. 17, 18. *But the mercy of the Lord is from everlaſting to everlaſting upon them that fear him, and his righteouſneſs unto Childrens Childrens, to ſuch as keep his Covenant, and to thoſe who remember his Commandments to do them.* And this is all that can be proved from the natural notion of an immutable love. But we cannot hence conclude, that God hath elected any particular perſons as the objects of this unchangeable love; whether this be ſo or

no,

no, muſt be determined by Revelation, which contains the declaration of the free purpoſes and counſels of the Divine Will.

It is impoſſible from the nature of God to determine, whether God has from all Eternity decreed whatever ſhall come to paſs in time; becauſe the Decrees of God are the free choice of his will, and therefore he might either decree, or not decree, as he pleaſed: Nor does the immutability of his Decrees depend immediately upon the immutability of his Nature, but upon the immutability of his Counſel, for God may if he pleaſe make temporary and conditional Decrees, which ſhall laſt but for a certain time, and be performed only upon certain conditions as well as thoſe which are abſolute and peremptory: And therefore when the Apoſtle to the *Hebrews* would prove the immutability of the Goſpel-Covenant, he does not argue from the immutable Nature of God, who cannot alter what he once decrees, but from his immutable Counſel, which he confirmed to *Abraham* by an Oath, *Heb.* 6. 13, 14, 16, 17, 18. *For when God made promiſe to* Abraham, *becauſe he could ſwear by no greater, he ſwear by himſelf, ſaying, ſurely bleſſing I will*

*bleſs*

*bleſs thee, and multiplying, I will multiply thee; for men verily ſwear by the greater, and an Oath for confirmation is to them an end of all ſtrife, wherein God willing more abundantly to ſhew unto the Heirs of Promiſe, the immutability of his Counſel, confirmed it by an Oath, that by two immutable things in which it was impoſſible for God to lie, we might have a ſtrong conſolation, who have fled for refuge to the hope ſet before us.* So that the foundation of our hope reſts upon the unchangeable counſel and purpoſe of God, confirmed by an Oath, which at moſt reſolves it ſelf not into an unchangeable love, but into unchangeable truth and faithfulneſs, that God will never alter that, which he hath promiſed never to alter. This is plainly expreſſed too in that Promiſe made to *David* concerning the perpetuity of his Kingdom, wherein he was a Type of Chriſt, and of the Eternal duration of his Kingdom, *Pſalm* 89. 33, 34, &c. *Nevertheleſs my loving kindneſs will I not utterly take from him, nor ſuffer my faithfulneſs to fail; My Covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips; once have I ſwore in my holineſs, that I will not lie unto* David, *his ſeed ſhall endure for ever, and his Throne as the Sun before me.* Thus to give but one inſtance more of this

this nature, when God by the Prophet *Iſaiah* makes ſuch a gracious Promiſe of the reſtauration of the Gentiles, and their incorporation into his Church, he confirms it in the very ſame manner, *Iſa.* 54.8,9,10. *In a little wrath I hid my face from thee, for a moment; but with everlaſting kindneſs will I have mercy on thee, ſaith the Lord thy Redeemer; for this is as the waters of* Noah *to me; for as I have ſworn, that the waters of* Noah *ſhould no more go over the earth, ſo have I ſworn, that I would not be wroth with thee, nor rebuke thee, for the Mountains ſhall depart, and the Hills be removed, but my kindneſs ſhall not depart from thee, neither ſhall the Covenant of my peace be removed, ſaith the Lord, that hath mercy on thee.*

And it is very obſervable, that throughout the Scripture, where it is ſaid, that God will not repent, it refers not to the immutability of his Nature, but of his Counſels; Thus in 1 *Sam.* 15. 28, 29. *Samuel* acquaints *Saul* with his immutable Decree to remove the Kingdom from him: *And Samuel ſaid unto him, the Lord hath rent the Kingdom of Iſrael from thee this day, and hath given it to a neighbour of thine, that is better than thou*; and to aſſure him of the Immutability of this Decree, he adds,

adds, *And alſo the ſtrength of Iſrael will not lie, nor repent, for he is not a man, that he ſhould repent.* The like we may ſee in *Jer.*4.28. where God denounces his ſevere Judgments againſt *Jeruſalem*: *For this ſhall the Earth mourn, and the heavens above be black becauſe I have ſpoken it; I have purpoſed, and will not repent, neither will I turn back from it:* Whereas in other caſes, notwithſtanding the Immutability of the Divine Nature, the Scripture frequently mentions Gods repenting both of the good and of the evil, which he had thought to do, when the change of the Object required ſuch a change in his affections, and in the adminiſtrations of his providence: Nay, in that very place where God aſſigns his own immutable Counſels, as the reaſon why he had not deſtroyed the Poſterity of *Jacob*, when they had ſo grievouſly provoked him, yet he thought it no blemiſh to his Immutability to aſſure them, that he would alter the adminiſtrations of his Providence according to thoſe changes and alterations which were in them; for his immutable Promiſe to *Abraham* required, that he ſhould not utterly deſtroy them, and his immutable love to holineſs and goodneſs required the latter, *Mal.*3.6,7. *For I*

*am the Lord, I change not, therefore ye Sons of Jacob are not conſumed. Return unto me, and I will return unto you ſaith the Lord of Hoſts.* And this is what I aſſerted, that the only natural Notion of an immutable love, which we can learn from the Contemplation of the Divine Nature, is that God always loves for the ſame reaſon; that he always loves thoſe who are good, and hates thoſe who are wicked, not that he always loves the ſame Perſon, let him be good or wicked: And as for what the Doctor objects againſt this, that then *either God indeed never loveth any man, be he who he will; or that he is changeable in his love upon outward external reaſons, as we are*; I think by his good leave I need chuſe neither of them; the firſt I by no means like, that becauſe God loves none but good men, therefore he loves no man, for though there are but a few good men in the world, yet I hope there are ſome, and I do as little like the other; for though God alter his love to any perſon, when he ceaſes to be good, yet this is not to change upon outward External reaſons, but upon ſuch reaſons as are eſſential to his Nature; for it is contrary to the holineſs of the Divine Nature to love wickedneſs, or a wicked man: God's

Vindicat. p. 187.

love

love to holineſs and hatred of evil is immutable as his nature is, and therefore when any Perſon ceaſes to be good, God muſt ceaſe to love, which does not argue any change in God, but in the Object, and when the Object is changed, the immutability of his love is the reaſon why he loves no longer.

As for what the Doctor adds, *In the mean time, ſuch a love of God towards Believers, as ſhall always effectually preſerve them meet Objects of his love and approbation, is not to be baffled by ſuch trifling impertinencies*: Whether what I have diſcourſed be a *trifling impertinency* let others judge; but when he makes it a neceſſary effect of an immutable love *effectually to preſerve ſuch Perſons meet Objects of love and approbation*, he grants all that I have contended for, that the immutability of Gods love in it ſelf conſidered is no argument, that he will always love the ſame Perſons, unleſs they continue *meet objects of his love*; for if the love of God be ſo immutable, as always to love the ſame Perſon, be he what he will, then ſuch a man is a meet Object of love, while he continues the ſame Perſon, whatever his qualities are, and there is no more required to this, than that God ſhould uphold him in

being: But if beſides his being ſuch a particular Perſon, on whom God hath fixt his love, there be any other qualifications required to make him, and preſerve him a meet Object of love, then the Doctor muſt acknowledge, that Gods immutable love requires an Object which does not change, one who perſiſts and perſeveres in the practice of an Univerſal Righteouſneſs, which is all I contend for, the immutable love of God to good men, under that notion as good: For ſuppoſing any change in the Object, God muſt either continue to love an unmeet Object, or elſe ceaſe to love: And let him chuſe which ſide he pleaſes; if the firſt, he attributes ſuch an immutability to God, as is inconſiſtent with wiſdom and holineſs, and ſavours more of the ſtubbornneſs and impotency of humane Paſſions, than of a Divine Love: If the latter, then he makes the Love of God as mutable and Subject to changes as I do.

And as *for that love of God to Believers, which always preſerves them meet objects of his love*, the Doctor mightily miſtakes me, if he thinks I deſigned to oppoſe it; I acknowledge the perſeverance of Believers to be the effect of the Divine Grace, as well as their believing at firſt; but if he deſigns

deſigns this for a deſcription of Gods electing love, which is the immutable cauſe both of faith and perſeverance, as it is plain he does, I wonder, why he calls it *Gods love to believers*; for Election in the Doctors judgment conſiders no qualifications in Perſons; and what he calls *Gods love*, is more properly Gods Decree to Love, when the Perſon is a fit object for it: And it is neceſſary to diſtinguiſh between an immutable Decree to make and preſerve a fit object of love, and the immutability of the Divine Love; The firſt depends upon an immutable Counſel; The ſecond upon the perſevering meetneſs and fitneſs of the object to be Beloved.

I have already given ſeveral other inſtances of this way of reaſoning from an acquaintance with Chriſts Perſon, from his being our Surety and Mediator, our Head and Husband, and the like, and intended to have added many more, but this is ſufficient to ſatisfie any impartial Reader, what I mean by an acquaintance with Chriſt's Perſon, and how far the Doctor and his Friends may be charged with it, and therefore at preſent I ſhall only briefly conſider this way of reaſoning, and put a concluſion to this Argument. *Vide ſupra* p. 171. &c

Intereſt of Reaſon, &c. p. 164.

Now I readily agree with Mr. *Fergusson*, that in many caſes it is not only juſtifiable, but neceſſary to Reaſon from Revelation; and I muſt needs ſay, that the inſtances he gives of it are unanſwerable, but whether they may be called deductions and conſequences from Revelation let others judge: As the application *of general Precepts, Promiſes, and Comminations to ſingle Individuals, and univerſal directions to particular caſes.* The application of ancient Propheſies to their Events, whereby the Apoſtles proved Chriſt to be that Meſſias who was to come. And the teſtimony of Miracles for the proof of a Revelation, which are the principal inſtances Mr. *Fergusson* gives, as will appear to any one who conſults thoſe Texts of Scripture, which he alleadges in this behalf. But this is nothing to our preſent Diſpute; the queſtion is, whether we may deduce any new Doctrinal Concluſions, which are neither expreſly taught in Scripture, nor can be found out by meer Principles of Reaſon, from their ſuppoſed connexion with ſome thing which is revealed.

And I think thus much we may ſafely ſay, that we can know no more of matters of pure Revelation than what is revealed;

revealed; whatever wholly depends upon the free and Soveraign Will of God can be known no other way but by Revelation, as no man can know the ſecret thoughts and counſels of a man, but thoſe who learn them from himſelf; and by the ſame reaſon that we can know nothing of theſe matters without a Revelation, we can know no more neither than what is revealed; which conſideration alone is ſufficient to overthrow this way of reaſoning from an *Acquaintance with the Perſon of Chriſt*. This Argument I have managed at large in my former Diſcourſe, and know not what I ſhould add to it here, unleſs it be a more particular application of it to our preſent caſe.

Knowledge of Chriſt, Chap. 3. ſect. 3.

As for inſtance, we learn from Revelation that Chriſt died for our ſins to make Atonement and Expiation for them, and to procure pardon and forgiveneſs for all true Penitents; but becauſe Chriſt died for our ſins, it does not hence follow that there is *ſuch a natural Vindictive Juſtice in God*, as would not ſuffer him to pardon ſin without a full ſatisfaction: for Chriſt's Death being the effect of Gods free Counſel, we can know no more of the cauſe, and reaſon, and motive of it

than he has revealed; there may be ſeveral other reaſons aſſigned on Gods part, why he ſhould ſend Chriſt into the world to ſave ſinners, beſides a natural Vindictive Juſtice, and the Scripture has aſſigned ſeveral other reaſons of Chriſt's Death, but has never aſſigned this: And indeed unleſs we will aſſert that the Death of Chriſt did neceſſarily reſult from the nature of God, and was not the effect of his free choiſe and counſel, this reaſoning muſt be falſe: For I hope they will acknowledge God to be as neceſſarily good, as he is juſt (for there is no reaſon, why goodneſs ſhould be thought the free act of Gods Will and Counſel, and Juſtice the neceſſity of his Nature,) and if ſo, then ſuppoſing the fall of man, which brought ſin and miſery into the world, the Death of Chriſt was as abſolutely neceſſary, as that God ſhould be good and juſt: The goodneſs of God (according to this way of reaſoning) made it neceſſary to redeem Mankind from that ſtate of miſery, and the Juſtice of God made it neceſſary for him to puniſh ſin. This puniſhment muſt fall either upon the Sinner himſelf, or ſome other in his ſtead; the Sinner cannot ſuffer the juſt deſert of ſin without being Eternally miſerable,

and

and none elſe could expiate our ſins but only the Son of God incarnate; who by being Man was capable of ſuffering, and by being God, gave an infinite value to his ſufferings, anſwerable to the infinite demerit of ſin: So that if God be as neceſſarily Good as he is Juſt, his Goodneſs did as neceſſarily determine him to provide a ranſom for ſinners, as his Juſtice did to puniſh ſin, and there being no other poſſible way of doing this, but by the Incarnation and Sufferings of his own Son, the Death of Chriſt is as neceſſary an effect of the Juſtice and Goodneſs of the Divine Nature, as Light is of the Sun.

Thus though Chriſt died for our ſins, yet we cannot meerly from the Death of Chriſt certainly conclude, that he died for all, or only for ſome, that he died for us abſolutely or conditionally; for the extent and efficacy of Chriſt's Death, as well as his Death it ſelf, depends upon the Will and Counſel of God, and therefore cannot be known without a Revelation.

Chriſt fulfilled all Righteouſneſs, but we cannot hence conclude, that he fulfilled all Righteouſneſs for us, and that we are accounted righteous for the ſake of his

his perfect Righteouſneſs imputed to us; for he might fulfil Righteouſneſs for a great many other reaſons, and this is the moſt unlikely reaſon of all: The ſame may be ſaid of thoſe choice Concluſions from Chriſt's being our Head and Huſband, our Surety and Mediator, our Phyſician, and Shepherd, and Rock, and Life, *&c.* Whatever Concluſions we draw from theſe which are not revealed in the Scripture are at beſt very uncertain and lubricous, becauſe all theſe Revelations and Offices of our Saviour, with their extent and vertue, and manner of their execution depend upon the free Counſel of God, and therefore can be known only by Revelation.

Indeed, thoſe who argue and reaſon from an Acquaintance with the Perſon of Chriſt ſeem to be aware of this, and therefore they endeavour to reduce the whole Myſtery of our Redemption by Chriſt to neceſſary cauſes, that God could not do otherwiſe, and that Mankind could not be ſaved in any other way, which is enough to prejudice all wiſe men againſt the whole Syſteme of their Divinity, and yet they can take no other courſe to uphold their cauſe, for if it be once ſuppoſed, that this may be otherwiſe,

all

all their Arguments will be found weak and unconcluding.

Thus for inſtance; if we ſuppoſe, that God may forgive true Penitents, without exacting ſatisfaction, this deſtroys their Notion of a natural Vindictive Juſtice, and their wild conceit about the nature of Chriſt's ſatisfaction, which is built on it, as if it were only to gratifie an inexorable revenge. If it be ſuppoſed, that God may forgive our ſins, and accept and reward our ſincere though imperfect ſervices for the ſake of Chriſt's Death, and Sufferings, and Righteouſneſs, without accounting us perfectly innocent and perfectly righteous with the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt; if God may for Chriſt's ſake diſpenſe with the rigour and ſeverity of the Law, and accept of ſincerity inſtead of perfection, than all their Arguments for the neceſſity of imputation (in their notion of it) fall to the ground.

If Chriſt may be our Surety and Mediator, and yet not be obliged to fulfil all Righteouſneſs in our ſtead, if Chriſt may fulfil all Righteouſneſs, and yet this Righteouſneſs not be imputed to us; if the antecedent neceſſity of Repentance and a new Life may be reconciled with the Grace of God, and the Merits of Chriſt,

than

than to be ſure it is not neceſſary it ſhould be otherwiſe, and then all their Arguments are weak and fallacious, for if they do not conclude neceſſarily, then the contrary may be true.

And is it not ſtrange preſumption for any men to ſay, that there is no other poſſible way for God to ſave Sinners than what they have deſcribed in their ill-digeſted Syſtemes, and yet all their Arguments from an acquaintance with Chriſt's Perſon proceed upon this, and can never be made good without it. For if they be not neceſſarily true, they may be falſe: And if they may be falſe, they are no good foundation for our Faith. We have an excellent inſtance of this in Mr. *Fergùſon's* way of proving the Myſtery of the Trinity from its neceſſary connexion with the Doctrine of Original Sin: *For the Myſtery of the Trinity hath a neceſſary Connexion with the Work of our Redemption by the Incarnation of the Son of God, and the Work of our Redemption by the Incarnation of an infinite Perſon hath the like Connexion with the neceſſity of ſatisfying Divine Juſtice, in order to diſpenſing of Pardon to repenting Offenders, and the neceſſity of ſatisfying Juſtice for the end aforeſaid, hath a neceſſary Connexion with the Doctrine of the corruption of Mankind;* and

Intereſt of Reaſon, p. 35.

*and the corruption of Humane Nature is both fully confeſſed, and may be demonſtrated by reaſon.* And thus the Myſtery of the Trinity is at laſt demonſtrated by reaſon, that is, from the wickedneſs and degeneracy of Mankind.

And thus they reaſon in other caſes; they prove the neceſſity of a Vindictive Juſtice, and the neceſſity of Satisfaction, and the neceſſity of the Incarnation and Sufferings of the Son of God, and the neceſſity of his fulfilling Righteouſneſs, and the neceſſity of Imputation, nay, a neceſſity of the Divine Decrees themſelves; For the Arguments, which they commonly alleadge in theſe caſes, if they have any force in them, muſt prove all this to be neceſſary, and without this can prove nothing elſe.

When we diſcourſe of the free Counſels and Purpoſes of the Divine Will, we muſt learn from Revelation what God has done, and what he will do, not argue what he muſt do: Or we may confirm our Faith by conſidering how fit and becoming it is, and how agreeable to the Divine Nature and Perfections, or at moſt may argue probably from ſome collateral Circumſtances, to prove the thing likely and probable, an inſtance of which I gave

Knowledge of Christ. Chap. 3. Sect. 3.

gave at large in my former discourse; but we must pretend to know no more of matters of pure Revelation, than what is revealed, unless we can either comprehend the infinite Methods of the Divine Wisdom, or discover a necessity of Nature in God, that he could do no other than what we fancy; or can pretend to a Spirit of Prophesie and Revelation, to discover those hidden Mysteries to us, which are either concealed or obscurely hinted in the External Revelation of the Letter. And indeed, sometimes they talk at this rate, as if every particular man must have an immediate Revelation from Christ to enable him to expound the External Revelation, which is but a dead Letter without it; and I know no other secure refuge they have, but to take Sanctuary in Enthusiasms and pretended Inspirations.

CHAP.

## CHAP. V.

### *Concerning the Union of Believers to Chriſt, and the imputation of Pelagianiſm.*

IT is time now to proceed to the conſideration of our Union to Chriſt, in which Argument Mr. *Ferguſon* has put out his whole ſtrength, ſuch as it is, which conſiſts only in ſome Childiſh Cavils, falſe Repreſentations, and inſolent and fooliſh Triumphs. Though I wonder he has no more craft, than to tell ſuch improbable Stories, as confute themſelves. As for inſtance, he charges my Notion of Union to Chriſt *with diſſerving holineſs*; Why, what is my Notion of Union? That I expreſſed in few words, That *Chriſt is a ſpiritual King, and all Chriſtians are his Subjects, and our Union to Chriſt conſiſts in our belief of his Revelations, obedience to his Laws, and ſubjection to his Authority*: How can this diſſerve Holineſs, which makes Holineſs and Obedience Eſſential to our Union? This is a very improbable Story, and I doubt he will find few Vouchers for it:

Intereſt of Reaſon in Religion, p. 443, &c

it: And yet to ſee the power of wit; he has two or three as plain proofs of it as heart can wiſh.

For firſt he obſerves, that I acknowledge, *that in one ſenſe we muſt be united to Chriſt before we can be holy*: But then he ought to have been ſo honeſt, as to have told what *ſenſe* that is. I ſhall tranſcribe that paſſage, and leave men to judge what they pleaſe of our Author. "Our Union "to Chriſt is more or leſs perfect, ac- "cording to our attainments in true Pie- "ty and Vertue. The firſt and loweſt de- "gree of our Union to Chriſt is a belief "of his Goſpel, which in order of na- "ture muſt go before Obedience to it; "but yet it includes a purpoſe and reſo- "lution of obeying it; and in this ſenſe "we muſt be united to Chriſt before we "can be holy, becauſe this belief of the "Goſpel is the great Principle of Obedi- "ence: But then our Union is not per- "fected without actual Obedience, this "makes us the true Diſciples of Chriſt, "when we are fruitful in good Works. So that all I affirm is, that we muſt firſt believe the Goſpel before we can obey it, and that a ſincere belief of the Goſpel, and a hearty reſolution of obeying it, does begin our union to Chriſt before we may have

Know-ledge of Chriſt, P. 349.

have the opportunities of External Obedience: The Internal acts of the mind, as Faith and Repentance, and the love of God, and the ſincere purpoſes of a new Life, are antecedently neceſſary to our Union to Chriſt; but External Holineſs and Obedience, which requires time and opportunities of action, which are not always in our power, may not always go before, but muſt always follow to complete and perfect our Union. Which I thus explained in the ſame place: "Chriſt "receives bad men as ſoon as they be-"lieve his Goſpel, and reſolve to be "good, but their Reward is ſuſpended "upon the performance of theſe Vows, "and this is no reproach to his Holi-"neſs.

But ſtill Mr. *Ferguſon* can prove, that I make our Union to Chriſt to be perfected without actual obedience, though I expreſly affirm the contrary, becauſe I ſay, *That to be in Chriſt ſignifies no more than being members of his viſible Church, which is made up of Hypocrites, as well as ſincere Chriſtians:* And ſo I ſay ſtill, That where Chriſt ſpeaks of *ſuch branches in him as bear no fruit*, Joh. 15. 2. By *being in him* he can intend no more than being Members of his viſible Church by a publick profeſſion of

Faith in him, for otherwiſe this Phraſe of *being in him* cannot be applied to hypocrites, who bear no fruit; But how does it hence follow, that our Union to Chriſt is compleated without Obedience? For did I ever aſſert, that an External Union to the viſible Church did complete and perfect our Union to Chriſt? And if it does not, then I hope we may ſafely aſſert, that to be in Chriſt is ſometimes taken in that Latitude of ſenſe, as to include Hypocrites as well as ſincere Chriſtians, and yet not aſſert a complete and perfect Union to Chriſt without Obedience.

But it is very pretty to obſerve our Authors Criticiſm upon our Saviours words, *Every branch in me that beareth not fruit,* which he ſays may as well be read, *Every branch that beareth not fruit in me, he taketh away*: Now ſuppoſe we ſhould be ſo civil, as to grant him this, What will he gain by it? Why, *then the true import of it is this, That unleſs we be in Chriſt we can bring forth no fruit to God, and that what ſhew of being branches we make by an External Memberſhip in the Church, yet that ſhall be no* obex *to Chriſts diſclaiming and renouncing our works.* His deſign is to prove, that *every branch in me* does not ſignifie thoſe branches which

*Ibid.* P. 145.

are

are in Christ; and therefore he will not joyn *In me* with *branch*, but with *beareth fruit*, which being a very dull observation may pass for his own: For I would fain learn of Mr. *Ferguson* in what this branch is: It is certain *de fide*, that it is a branch, unless he can find some new reading to avoid that too; Of what then is it a branch? There is nothing in the Context to which this branch can refer, but only the Vine, which is Christ; and therefore if it be a branch, do what he can, it must be a branch in the Vine, a branch in Christ. And then I have a farther scruple still (supposing we did allow his reading) how a branch, which is not in Christ the Vine can bear fruit in Christ the Vine: And therefore if it be acknowledged, that God expects from such branches, that they should bear fruit in Christ, it must be confessed, that in one sense or other they are in him; for they can in no sense be said to bear fruit in him, till in some sense they may be said to be in him. And there is still one little difficulty behind, what is meant by God's *taking away* those branches which bear not fruit in Christ: This is a plain Allusion to the Husbandman's cutting dead and fruitless branches off from the Vine, and

ſo ſignifies the Exciſion of ſuch fruitleſs branches from the body of Chriſt; and how can they be cut off, and taken away from Chriſt, if they were never in him.

And yet after all our Author is forced to return to what he deſigned to confute, and by a *Branch* to underſtand one who lives in *External Memberſhip with the Church*, and by ſo doing *makes a ſhew of being a branch in Chriſt*, that is, (as he muſt mean, if he means any thing) of being vitally united to him, when he is not; which is as much as ever I aſſerted in this matter; only he will by no means allow, that theſe branches may be ſaid to be in Chriſt, though he owns them to be members of the viſible Church of Chriſt; and yet he has no way to prove, that a *branch* in this place ſignifies a *Church member*, but only becauſe it is called a branch in Chriſt.

A ſecond and third Argument, whereby Mr. *Ferguſon* proves my Notion of Union to Chriſt to be deſtructive to Holineſs, are both reſolved into this, That I deny the ſupernatural aſſiſtances of Grace from Chriſt to make men holy; and therefore that Holineſs and Obedience, which alone I make neceſſary to our Union to Chriſt

*Ibid.* P. 447, &c

Chriſt is not true Goſpel-holineſs, *as not being owing to an infuſed Principle derived from Jeſus by the effectual operation of the Holy Ghoſt.* And that it is impoſſible for any Perſons, *though compleatly and perfectly united to Chriſt, to attain true Holineſs for the future, becauſe Chriſt is not conſidered as a quickning Head, and a vital root of influences to us.* Now though I ſuppoſe Mr. *Ferguſon* and I ſhall hardly agree about the manner of the Holy Spirits working in us, which he affirms to be by *a real and Phyſical operation*, yet I never denied, but have expreſly owned the Divine Influences of Grace from Chriſt, as will appear plainly before I conclude this Chapter. But ſuppoſe for once that I had denied this, and had affirmed, that men might be holy without it, would it hence follow, that I rejected the neceſſity of holineſs, or made it impoſſible to Mankind, becauſe (though falſely) I ſhould aſſert, that men are and may be holy without ſuch ſupernatural ſtrength and power. Yes, for this is not a *Goſpel-Holineſs*, which is wholly owing to the Divine Grace: But does the efficient cauſe then conſtitute the nature of things? Suppoſe two men, one immediately created by God, another begotten in the ordinary courſe of nature, but both per-

fectly alike, as to all the Eſſentials of Humane Nature, does this make ſuch a difference between them, that one muſt not be called a man, as well as the other, becauſe one was created, and the other begotten. Thus in the ſame manner, ſuppoſe one man immediately created by God perfectly righteous and holy, as *Adam* was; Another, who is renewed and ſanctified by infuſed Principles of Grace, and by the Phyſical operation of the Spirit; And a third, who by diligence and induſtry, by reaſon and diſcourſe, and the wiſe improvement of his natural faculties, hath arrived to the ſame temper of mind, to the ſame Principles and Habits of Action, which were immediately created in the firſt, and Phyſically infuſed into the ſecond. If there were ſuch a man, as this, I would willingly underſtand, why he ſhould not be accounted as truly and properly holy as either of the former; by the ſame reaſon, that he is as true a man, who is begotten by the ſtrength of nature, as *Adam* was, who was immediately created, or as Chriſt was, who was formed in the Virgins Womb by the overſhadowing of the Holy Ghoſt.

The

The original Holineſs of God is the Pattern of all Holineſs, and the holineſs of Creatures conſiſts in a conformity to the Divine Image, not in being produced by a Divine Power: The ſanctifying operation of the Holy Spirit is neceſſary to the Being, not to the Nature of Holineſs: Could that which we call Holineſs be produced by the ſtrength of natural Reaſon, and our natural Faculties, it would be nevertheleſs Holineſs for that: And therefore unleſs Mr. *Ferguſon* can prove, that that Holineſs, which I make eſſential to our Union to Chriſt, is defective in ſomething which conſtitutes the nature of Holineſs, though he could prove that I attributed Holineſs to the ſtrength and power of Nature, he will only make himſelf ridiculous, by charging my Notion with deſtroying the neceſſity of Goſpel-holineſs.

But this whole charge was the effect only of a weak and contemptible revenge, becauſe I had charged them (and made good my charge) *with placing our Union to Chriſt before holineſs of life*: What defence can Mr. *Ferguſon* make againſt this? Truly none at all, but according to his old way he denies it, without attempting to anſwer any thing which I

Knowledge of Christ. Chap. 4. Sect. 4.

alleadged in the proof of it: And yet (which argues him to be a man of much greater courage than wit) at the very ſame time he denies and owns it, or which comes much to one, profeſſes that it is very indifferent to him, whether it be ſo or not. He tells us, *All that we plead for is this; That as previouſly to our Union with Chriſt, we are polluted and unholy, ſo by that very act, whereby he unites us to himſelf, he infuſes thoſe Principles into us, whereby our natures are cleanſed, and we come to be denominated holy and pure.* Here he expreſly acknowledges, that before our Union to Chriſt we are polluted, and unholy, and therefore we muſt be united to him while we are unholy, for every minute before, our Union is previous to it. Well, but then *by the ſame act that he aſſumes us into Union with himſelf, he transforms our natures.* Suppoſe that yet we are unholy till we are united, for we are made holy by vertue of our Union; and our Author tells us, *That it is a needleſs enquiry, whether our Renovation in order of nature precede our Union with Chriſt, or whether our Union go before our Renovation, ſeeing in order of time they are not only inſeparable, but that which is the new Creature, the Seed of God, and Divine Nature in us is the very bond of our Coheſion.*

Intereſt of Reaſon, p. 440, 441.

*ſion.* Say you ſo Sir? *Is this a needleſs enquiry?* Then it ſeems it is indifferent, whether we be conſidered as united to Chriſt before or after we are holy; and why then ſhould he pretend ſo much to abhor the thoughts of our being united to Chriſt while we are unholy? And yet how this agrees with making the New Creature *the bond of Cohæſion*, I cannot underſtand, ſince in order of nature, we can have no notion of any Union before or without its bond.

But to conſider this a little, whether it be ſo indifferent to place our Union to Chriſt in order of nature before or after our Renovation: (For I never charged them with ſaying that thoſe, who are in Chriſt may continue unholy, becauſe they, as well as the *Antinomians*, do affirm, That Holineſs is a neceſſary and Phyſical effect of our Union to Chriſt, though their Principles overthrow the neceſſary Obligations to it) whoever is conſidered as united to Chriſt muſt be conſidered in a ſtate of favour and acceptation with God, as cloathed with the perfect Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, as pardoned through his Bloud, and ſo an actual Heir to Eternal Life and Glory; now if a man may be conſidered as pardoned,

and

and juſtified, and an Heir of Glory, in order of nature before he is holy, before he repents of his ſins, or loves God, or ſo much as reſolves and purpoſes to obey him, this I am ſure overthrows the whole Chriſtian Religion, which denounces the wrath of God againſt every man, who is wicked, to the very laſt minute, wherein he may be conſidered as wicked, and promiſes Pardon and Eternal Life only to thoſe who actually repent and love God: If we may be conſidered in order of nature, as united to Chriſt before we are holy, then there is nothing in Sin contrary to the nature of our Union, and then we may as well be united to Chriſt in order of time, as in order of nature, before we are holy, and then we may (if Chriſt pleaſe) as well continue united, as at firſt be united to him without holineſs: For if neither the nature of the Goſpel-Covenant, nor the nature of God and Chriſt, hinder ſuch a Union between Chriſt and bad men, while they may be conſidered as bad, then nothing can hinder their continuing bad after they are united to Chriſt, but an arbitrary Decree, or an irreſiſtible Power. Chriſt may make them good if he pleaſes by an Almighty Power, but there is no reaſon can be

aſſigned,

aſſigned, why he may not as well own them, while they continue wicked, as receive them into Union with himſelf, while they were conſidered as ſuch. Chriſt may undertake the cure of bad men, as Phyſicians do the cure of the ſick, this was the great end of his coming into the world, not to call the Righteous, but Sinners to repentance; but to unite them to himſelf, to receive them into a ſtate of favour and reconciliation, to intereſt them in his Righteouſneſs, to make them Heirs of Glory, while they are conſidered as bad, in order of nature before they are renewed and ſanctified, is contrary to the holineſs of his Nature, to the expreſs declarations of his Goſpel, and perfectly alters the whole frame of the Chriſtian Religion.

This gives us a little taſte, what candour and honeſty we may expect from our Author in his enſuing Diſcourſe, in the examination of which I ſhall not confine my ſelf to his method, but ſhall content my ſelf to vindicate my own Diſcourſe *of our Union to Chriſt* in that order and method wherein it lies, which will give me occaſion to conſider whatever I am concerned to anſwer in Mr. *Ferguſon's* Chapter of Union, and then his ſcurrilous reflexions,

Knowledge of Chriſt, Chap. 4. Sect. 1.

flexions, and Childiſh impertinencies will need no anſwer.

The two firſt Propoſitions which I laid down in order to explain our Union to Chriſt are theſe: Firſt, *That theſe Metaphors, which deſcribe the Relation and Union between Chriſt and Chriſtians, do primarily refer to the Chriſtian Church, not to every individual Chriſtian.* And ſecondly, *That the Union of particular Chriſtians to Chriſt is by means of their Union to the Chriſtian Church.* Which Mr. *Ferguſon* tells us, *Are in his opinion things coincident:* If by *Coincident* he means, that one follows from the other, I readily grant it; but if he means, that the Propoſitions are the ſame, which have neither the ſame ſubject nor predicate, he might have ſpared his reflexions either upon my Logick, or accuracy of Writing, as being a very incompetent Judge of either: But the Propoſitions are diſtinct and proved by different Mediums; that which proves the firſt Propoſition does not immediately prove the ſecond; though Mr. *Ferguſon* would perſwade the world, that I had argued at that inconſequent rate, and charges my Logick with the miſcarriages and failures of his own, which was the moſt effectual way he could take to make it ridiculous.

Intereſt of Reaſon, p. 597.

*Ibid.* p. 611.

And

And yet after he had charged them with being *coincident* Propoſitions, which ſignifie the ſame thing, at the very next turn he is ſo far from owning them coincident, that he will not allow one to be ſo much as a juſt conſequent from the other: For having recited that Paragraph, whereby I proved, *That the Metaphors, which deſcribe the Relation and Union between Chriſt and Chriſtians, do primarily refer to the Chriſtian Church, not to every individual Chriſtian:* He adds, *To this I anſwer.* 1. *That were this Diſcourſe of our Author framed into a Syllogiſm, the incongruity between the Concluſion and Premiſes would eaſily appear. For example, Chriſt is the Head of the Church,* ergo, *no particular Believer is united to him, but by means of their Union with the Church.* Let us learn then how he diſproves it; *I deny* (ſays he) *the Conſequent,* (I ſuppoſe he would have ſaid *Conſequence,* had he underſtood the difference of thoſe Logical terms) his Reaſon is this: *Surely, though the King be immediate Head to the whole Kingdom, yet he is immediate head to every Individual Perſon in it.* As for that word *Immediate,* I ſhall let it alone till anon, but our Author ſays very right; The King is the Head of every Subject, as well as of the whole Kingdom, and ſo is Chriſt the Head of every parti-

particular Chriſtian, as well as of the whole Church; but this is not the thing in Controverſie: The queſtion is, Whether a King, who is Head only of his own Kingdom, can be ſaid to be the Head of any ſingle Perſon, who is not of his Kingdom, and therefore whether ſuch a Perſon muſt not firſt be incorporated into his Kingdom, before he can be related to the King as his Head: Thus Chriſt is *primarily* ſtiled a Head with reference to his whole Church, which is his body, and therefore thoſe who are not of this Church and body cannot be related to him, as to their Head; the only way to be related to Chriſt, as our Head, is to be incorporated into his Church, which is his body: For no head has relation to any members, which are not united to its own body.

But our Author proceeds: 2. *The Church and its Individual Members being of an Homogenious nature, whatſoever is prædicated eſſentially of the whole, is equally prædicated of every part.* If by this he only means, that Chriſt may as well be called the Head of particular Chriſtians, as of the whole Chriſtian Church, I readily grant it, though it be nothing to the purpoſe; but the Propoſition is the moſt abſurd and

ſenſe-

ſenſeleſs that ever was framed. A River is a Homogeneous body, and yet every drop of water cannot be called a River. The Union of ſeveral things of the ſame nature gives them a new denomination, which cannot belong to every particular: A Kingdom conſiſts of a great many men, who are as much of the ſame Homogeneous nature as men, as Chriſtians are, as they are Chriſtians; and yet every particular man cannot be called a Kingdom. The body of Chriſt conſiſts of a great many particular Chriſtians, and yet every Chriſtian is not the body of Chriſt: And beſides this, it is fulſomly abſurd to ſay, that *the Church and its Individual Members are of an Homogeneous nature*: For the Church is an organized body, which conſiſts of ſeveral Chriſtians, who conſidered as Members, are of as different a nature as the hand, and eye, and foot, which are of different uſe, neceſſity, and honour: So the Apoſtle tells us, 1 *Cor.* 12. 12,13,14, &c. *For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body being many are one body, ſo alſo is Chriſt.* And he particularly mentions the Foot, and the Ear, and the Eye, which no man yet thought to be of an Homogeneous nature, till Mr. *Ferguſon* bleſſed the

the world with this Diſcovery. His third and fourth Arguments proceed upon the ſame miſtake, and indeed are the very ſame in *terminis*: That every member of the body, as well as the whole body is united to the Head, that the Church is Chriſt's Body, and we are all Members in particular, which is the very thing I contend for. But Mr. *Ferguſon* ought to have proved, that every member is the body of Chriſt, or that any one can be a member of Chriſt, without being a member of his body; that any Chriſtian can be ſaid to be married to Chriſt, or to be his Spouſe upon any other account, than with reſpect to his relation to the Church, which is his Spouſe. That theſe expreſſions may be uſed of particular Chriſtians upon account of their relation to the whole body, I deny not; but the primary uſe of theſe Metaphors is to deſcribe the relation between Chriſt and his Church, and are ſecondarily applied to particular Chriſtians, and particular Churches as they are members of the Univerſal Church.

But to come cloſer to the buſineſs, Mr. *Ferguſon's* great ſpight is at the ſecond Propoſition, *That the Union of particular Chriſtians with Chriſt is by means of their Union*

*Union to the Chriſtian Church.* Now methinks our Author in common prudence ought not to have expreſſed too great a zeal againſt this Notion, till he had found out ſome better way of ſtating it: And yet there are two or three plain queſtions, which I am ſure he can never anſwer, without owning all I contend for in this matter.

As firſt, whether Chriſt have more than one body; I ſuppoſe he dares not ſay he has, becauſe the Apoſtle has expreſly told us, that there is but *one body*, as there is but *one Spirit*, *Eph.*4.4. And therefore I would ask him ſecondly, whether every Chriſtian, as a Chriſtian, be not a member of Chriſt; this I preſume he will not deny neither; and therefore thirdly I enquire farther, whether any Chriſtian can be a member of Chriſt without being a member of his body: And unleſs our Author be very fond of non ſenſe, and thinks every thing true which is unintelligible he dares not ſay it; and then the Conſequence is very plain, that no man can be conſidered as a Chriſtian, that is, *as united to Chriſt*, without being conſidered as incorporated into the Chriſtian Church: For no man can be a member of Chriſt without being a member

of his body, which is his Church.

Vindicat. P. 15. Mr. *Hooker*, in that very Paragraph which Dr. *Owen* alleadges, as he thought, againſt me, aſſerts this in as expreſs words as ever I did: *In God we actually are no longer than from the time of our actual Adoption into the body of his true Church, into the fellowſhip of his Children. For his Church he knoweth and loveth, ſo that they, that are in the Church, are thereby known to be in him. Our being in Chriſt by Eternal Fore-knowledge ſaveth us not, without our actual and real Adoption into the Fellowſhip of his Saints in this world. For in him we actually are by actual incorporation into that Society, which hath him for their Head, and doth make together with him one body.* I am not aſhamed to confeſs, that I cannot anſwer this, though the comfort is, that I have no need to do it. If Dr. *Owen* be of this mind, as methinks he ſhould be by this quotation, I would deſire him to anſwer Mr. *Ferguſon*; if he be not, let him anſwer Mr. *Hooker*, or at leaſt give an account to the world for what purpoſe he alleadged his authority, for grant but this, and I ſee nothing in that long Paragraph, which will do him any kindneſs, or me any injury. But to return to Mr. *Ferguſon*, there needs no more to take off the force of his little Cavils,

Cavils, than to ſtate the true meaning of that Propoſition, *That particular Chriſtians are united to Chriſt by means of their Union to the Chriſtian Church*; which I perceive he either does not, or will not underſtand. And I ſhall do that in theſe following Propoſitions.

Firſt, this does not ſignifie, that it is one thing to be united to the Church, and another thing to be united to Chriſt, but our Union to Chriſt conſiſts in our Union to the Chriſtian Church, as at other times I expreſs it: For there is no other way for a member to be united to the Head, but by being united to the body: And by its Union to the body it is united to the Head; and we cannot ſo much as conſider any priority of nature, much leſs of time between theſe two: For though we may diſtinctly conſider the relation, which is between the particular members of the body to each other, and that relation, which every particular member has to the head, and for a more diſtinct conception of them, may repreſent one as the means to the other; yet when we conſider the relation which is between the head and particular members, we can form no other Notion of it, than their Union to that body which is

Know-ledge of Chriſt. p. 145, &c

united to the Head. Hence it is, that when I explain that Metaphor of Chriſt's being a Vine, ſometimes by Vine I underſtand *the Chriſtian Church*, which is founded on a belief of the Goſpel of Chriſt, and is united to him as their Head: Sometimes I expreſs it more diſtinctly, that *I am the Vine* ſignifies, *Chriſt together with his Church, which is his body*, in which Mr. *Perguſon* fancies great contradictions: That the Vine ſhould ſometimes ſignifie the Church, ſometimes Chriſt together with his Church; but *this favours only of his dulneſs and hebetude*, to uſe his own Phraſe, or which is as likely, of a prevaricating conſcience. For when I ſay the Church is the Vine, no man in his wits could imagine, that I excluded the conſideration of Chriſt the Head, eſpecially when I immediately explain it by Chriſt and his Church, that is the Head and the Body: For it is the very ſame thing, when we ſpeak of our Union to Chriſt, to ſay, that we are united to Chriſt, or that we are united to his Church, that we are united to the Head, or to the Body, ſince our Union to both is the very ſame. And therefore it is indifferent whether we explain this Metaphor of the Vine by the Chriſtian Church, which is the body of Chriſt, and inſepa-

Intereſt of Reaſon, &c. p. 459.

rably

rably united to the Head, or by Christ considered as Head, which implies a necessary relation to his body, to which particular Christians are united. We are in Christ as members are in the body, which unites them to the head, which is our being engrafted into this spiritual Vine: Christ is in us, as the Head is in the members, by his Influences and Government, by his Word dwelling and abiding in us, *Joh.*15.7. And now I hope no man will believe me so senseless, as to deny the Union of Christians *to the Person of Christ* (as Mr. *Ferguson* would perswade the World I do) when I acknowledge our Union to him, as the Head of the Church, as the great Prophet, and Ruler, Prince and Saviour of his body, which he is, as he is a Person: And therefore when I affirm, *That when Christ speaks in the first Person I and in Me, he cannot mean this of his own Person, but of his Church, Doctrine, and Religion, according as the circumstances of the place require*; the plain meaning of it is this, that we must not consider the Person of Christ as abstracted from his being the Head of his Church, and the great Prophet and Teacher of it, as these men do, as will appear more in what follows.

*Ibid.* p.461. 499.

Secondly, I obſerve, that we are united to Chriſt and to the Church by the very ſame act, as it muſt neceſſarily be, if the Union be the ſame. Faith in Chriſt, and ſuch a publick profeſſion of it, as he requires, unites us to Chriſt, and incorporates us into the Chriſtian Church, that is, makes us members of Chriſt's body, which is our Union to him. We are not firſt united to Chriſt by Faith, and then united to the Church by our ſubſequent choice and conſent, by explicite Contracts, as ſome imagine without any reaſon or preſident of the Apoſtolick Age; but that Faith, which unites us to Chriſt, incorporates us into his Church, makes us members of his body, wherein our Union conſiſts, and that obliges us, as we will own our Chriſtianity, to a viſible Communion with the Church, where it may be had.

Thirdly, to make this yet more clear, we muſt conſider what is meant by the Church in this queſtion: Now the general Notion of a Church is, *a Religious Society founded on the belief of the Goſpel, and an acknowledgment of the Authority of Chriſt, and united to him as their Head; who rules and governs them either immediately by himſelf,*

*ſelf, or by the mediation of Church-Officers, authorized by him for that purpoſe.* That Chriſt deſigned not only to reform and ſave ſome particular men, but to erect a Church, and to unite all his Diſciples to himſelf in one body, is ſo very evident, that were not men acted by Faction and Intereſt, it could admit no ſerious diſpute: All the Metaphors, which deſcribe our Union to Chriſt, do primarily refer to the Chriſtian Church, as I obſerved before: Chriſt is the Head, and the Church his body, and the Apoſtle tells us, that there is but one body; and that he is the Saviour of the body, and that he has redeemed his Church with his own bloud: The Jewiſh Church was Typical of the Chriſtian, and they were all of one Family, the carnal Seed and Poſterity of *Abraham*, and were all united by the ſame Laws, and Religious Ceremonies, and there was no way for an Alien to partake of the Priviledges of that holy people, but by being incorporated into the body of *Iſrael* (who were the Heirs of the Promiſes) by Baptiſm and Circumciſion. Now as the Jews were the carnal Poſterity of *Abraham*, ſo the Apoſtle tells us, that Chriſtians are his ſpiritual Seed, the Sons of God, and the

Children of *Abraham* by Faith, *Gal.* 3. 26,29. (*i. e.*) We are admitted into *Abraham's* Family, and made Heirs according to Promiſe: When God caſt off the Jewiſh Church, he did not leave himſelf without a Church in the world, but *as ſome of thoſe branches were broken off*, ſo the Chriſtians, who before their Converſion were many of them Pagan Idolaters, *a wild Olive tree, were graffed in among them, and with them partake of the root and fatneſs of the Olive tree*, Rom. 11.27. So that Chriſt did not come to diſſolve, but to reform the Church: He owns no relation to particular men, as ſcattered Individuals, but as incorporated into his Church. Now the internal Union of the Church to Chriſt conſiſts in a ſincere and lively Faith, and a voluntary ſubjection to his Authority; the External Ligaments of it, are an External and viſible profeſſion of our Faith, and ſolemn Vows of Obedience (which is regularly according to our Saviours Inſtitution performed in Baptiſm) and external and viſible Communion, and the external Miniſtries of Grace, to which our Saviour has ordinarily annexed the internal operations of his Spirit, as will appear more hereafter.

Now

Now though Internal Union by a ſincere and hearty Faith, and a ſubjection of our ſelves to the Laws and Government of Chriſt will unite us to his inviſible Church, where there is no viſible Society of Chriſtians profeſſing the faith of Chriſt, and living in a regular Communion and Fellowſhip with each other; Yet where there is, we cannot be united to Chriſt's body without a viſible incorporation into his Church: For the viſible and inviſible Church of Chriſt is but one body, and to renounce the Communion of the viſible Church, where it may be had without any injury to our internal Union, that is, without being forced to renounce any Article of the Chriſtian Faith, or to violate any of the Chriſtian Laws, is in effect to renounce Chriſtianity: For Chriſt hath appointed no other ordinary method of our Union to his body, but thoſe ordinary and regular ways of incorporation into his Church, and though he will diſpenſe with ordinary ways in extraordinary caſes, yet we have no reaſon to think he will ordinarily do ſo, which would be to diſſolve his viſible Church, or to make External Communion the moſt arbitrary and precarious thing in the world.

A ſecret Faith in Chriſt, and acknowledgment of his Authority does not ordinarily unite us to his body, but is only a neceſſary qualification, and diſpoſition to ſuch a Union: But in order to an actual Union there is required ſuch a publick profeſſion of our Faith, and ſolemn Vows of Obedience, performed with ſuch initial Rites, as our Saviour has appointed, as does actually incorporate us into the Chriſtian Church, as makes us members of the Univerſal Church, viſible or inviſible, and more immediately unites us to the particular Church wherein we live; juſt as it is in our admiſſion into any Relation or Society, there is required an antecedaneous conſent to qualifie us for it, but this alone does not unite to ſuch a Society, without ſuch particular Ceremonies, or publick Oaths and Engagements as by the Laws of that Society are required to our actual admiſſion: And therefore in the Ancient Church the *Clinici*, who delayed their Baptiſm till they were under the apprehenſions of death, though all their lives they profeſſed the Faith of Chriſt, yet refuſing by this holy Rite to be actually incorporated into the Church, they were looked on at beſt as a very imperfect ſort of Chriſtians.

of

of whoſe ſtate there was juſt reaſon for doubt and jealouſie.

Fourthly, we may obſerve ſome difference in the manner of our admiſſion into the Church according to the different ſtates and diſpenſations of it: We may conſider the Church in its *Idea* and *Embrio*, before there be any viſible Society of Chriſtians, and in this caſe, though the firſt Believer cannot be ſaid to be admitted into any Society of Chriſtians, yet he may be ſaid to be admitted into the Church: For then the Church ſignifies Chriſt, who is the Head, and ſuch a platform and Idea of a Society, which is to be ſet up in the world, formed according to ſuch a model of Laws and Government, Priviledges, and Immunities as are deſcribed in the Goſpel. This is no other than what is neceſſary in the firſt forming of any Societies upon a publick Charter or Commiſſion: He who is firſt admitted into any Colledge or Corporation is made a member of that Society, though as yet there be none but himſelf, for there is the foundation of a Society laid, where there is a Head and Governour, and publick Laws, and Conſtitutions, and Priviledges for the Goverment of it.

Thus

Thus when our Saviour did converſe upon earth, and was a viſible Head, then the way to be united to him was immediately to put themſelves under his Government, to go directly to him, and to profeſs their Faith and ſubjection to him: Upon which account Faith is called *coming to Chriſt*, which Phraſe is never uſed to ſignifie believing, but only in the Goſpels, and with reference to that time, while he converſed on earth: But ſince Chriſt aſcended into heaven, and left a viſible Authority in the Church, there is no other way of admiſſion into his Church but by the Miniſtry of men inveſted with his Authority, nor is there any other way of ſubmitting our ſelves to the Authority of Chriſt, but by a regular ſubjection to the Diſcipline and Government of the Church as you may ſee more at large in my former Diſcourſe.

Knowledge of Chriſt, p. 162.

Theſe things being premiſed, it will be a very eaſie task to anſwer all Mr. *Ferguſon's* little Cavils. As 1. He argues, *If particular Chriſtians be united to Chriſt only by virtue of a previous relation to the Church, I would then fain know of Mr.* Sherlock, *how the whole Church comes to be united to the Lord Jeſus.* If this will do him any kindneſs, it is quickly anſwered: For the whole Church

Intereſt of Reaſon, &c. P. 59.

Church is united to Christ, just as particular Christians are united, by Faith and Obedience: The only difference is, that the Church is united as a body, particular Christians as members of that body. The foundation of this Objection is, That our Author imagined, that our Union to the Church, and our Union to Christ, were two distinct things, and that we are united to Christ and to the Church by two different acts, and then indeed his Argument would have entangled me in a Circle, but I have already broke this Circle in my first and second Propositions. *For though the Church being an aggregate body of believers, can no other ways embrace the Revelations of the Gospel, or yield obedience to its commands but in the virtue of what her particular constituent members do*; yet this may be done in such a manner, as to unite them all to Christ, not as single Individuals, but as formed and cemented into a regular and well-proportioned body.

His second Argument in short is this, *That the Christian Church being nothing else but the collective body of Christians, it naturally follows, that they must in priority of nature be Christians before they can any way belong to the Church.* But I can imagine no reason for this;

this; for it is ſufficient, if they be made Chriſtians by their Union to the Church, for then the Church will ſtill be the collective body of Chriſtians. And indeed if every Chriſtian be a member of Chriſt, it is not imaginable how any ſhould be a Chriſtian, before he be united to the body of Chriſt.

His third Argument is, *That the Apoſtles were immediately united to Chriſt without any antecedent relation to the Church, and therefore every Individual Chriſtian may be ſo too*: And this he proves, *becauſe there was no Chriſtian Church pre-exiſtent to them, into whoſe Fellowſhip and Society they could be admitted*: But this I have already anſwered in my fourth Propoſition, that we may be ſaid to be admitted into the Church, where there is no viſible Society of Chriſtians to joyn with: If Chriſt might then be called the Head of the Church, I know no reaſon why the Apoſtles at that time might not be called the members of it. And though the Apoſtles were immediately under the Government and Inſtruction of Chriſt, while he was viſibly preſent with them, yet I ſuppoſe there may be ſome reaſon aſſigned, why other Chriſtians cannot be ſo immediately united to him, now he is not preſent as a viſible Head on earth.

*Thus*

*Thus far*, Mr. *Ferguſon* tells us, *he has diſcourſed theſe things, taking the Church for the Univerſal Catholick viſible Church, which is the moſt favourable acceptation to befriend my Notion*; But I can tell him a more favourable acceptation than this, which he durſt not touch on, *The Univerſal Catholick Church, viſible or inviſible*: For the viſible and inviſible is the ſame Church of Chriſt, and every Chriſtian being a member of Chriſt's body, which is but one, every Chriſtian is as truly united to the inviſible, as to the viſible part of it; and where there is no viſible Church, our Union to Chriſt is ſecured by our Union to the inviſible Church. Had Mr. *Ferguſon* thought on this, he would not have urged that Argument from the Union of the Apoſtles and firſt Believers to Chriſt, without any pre-exiſtent Church to be united to: Unleſs he thinks that *Abraham*, *Iſaac* and *Jacob*, and all the good men, who lived before Chriſt's Incarnation, were not of his Church, and then I would deſire him to tell me how they were ſaved. Whoever is admitted into the Chriſtian Church muſt of neceſſity be admitted by the Miniſters of ſome particular Church, but yet this makes him a member of the Univerſal Church, which

which is Christ's body. Our relation, as we are Christians, is to the whole body of Christ, and to a particular Church, as a branch and member of it; our Christianity is not confined to any particular Society of Christians, but our obligation to external fellowship with any sound part of the Church of Christ, where-ever the Providence of God casts us, is our antecedent relation, at least in priority of nature, to the whole Christian Church. Thus I am sure our Church of *England* in her Office of Baptism declares, that she receives the baptized Person *into the Fellowship of Christ's Church*, not of this, or that particular Church, but of the whole Church of Christ, and teaches her Children, that in their Baptism they are made *the members of Christ*, which word is of a larger import than the members of a particular Church: And St. *Paul* tells us, that as there is *but one body*, so there is but *one Baptism*, which makes us members of that one body. This was one Argument whereby the Fathers in the Council of *Carthage* proved the invalidity of that Baptism which was administred by Hereticks and Schismaticks, who separated from the Church; because they being out of the Church, could not admit any

one

one into the Catholick Church. *Frustra ille putat se esse baptizatum, cùm non sit baptisma nisi in Ecclesia, unum, & verum, quia Deus unus, & fides una, & Ecclesia una est, in qua stat unum baptisma, & sanctitas, & cætera; nam quæ foris exercentur, nullum habent salutis effectum.* Now whether they were mistaken in their Conclusion or not, the Premises were the received Doctrine of the Catholick Church, owned by those very Fathers, who opposed the rebaptization of Schismaticks. *Cypr. Conc. Carthag.*

We are united to Christ by our Union with the Catholick visible or invisible Church, which necessarily includes our visible Fellowship and Society with that particular Church, wherein we live, when we may hold Communion with it without renouncing the Christian Faith, or violating any express Law, which our Saviour has given us; as I discourse more fully in my other Book: And when we cannot joyn in Communion with any visible Society of Christians without renouncing our fidelity to Christ, our Union to Christ is then secured in our spiritual Union to his invisible Church and body. Knowledge of Christ. p. 165, &c

Now this gives a plain solution to all Mr. *Ferguson's* Arguments, whereby he

proves, *That Communion with a particular Church cannot be the medium of a Chriſtians Union to Chriſt.* Though I never aſſerted this any other ways, than as communion with a particular Church, where it may be had, is eſſential to our Union with the Univerſal Church. But let us hear what he ſays: Firſt, *there may be ſome Individual Chriſtians, where there is no particular inſtituted Church of Chriſt into which they can be admitted.* Then if they be Chriſtians, they are united to the Univerſal Church: *But there can be no particular Church without the pre-exiſtence of Individual Believers.* Right, but every Individual Believer is not a Chriſtian till he be incorporated into the Chriſtian Church: Faith is neceſſary to qualifie a man for admiſſion into the Church, but though God may diſpenſe with extraordinary caſes, yet ordinarily Faith alone does not make a man a Chriſtian, as appears from the third Propoſition: We muſt believe and be baptized if we will be ſaved: For Baptiſm ordinarily incorporates us into the Chriſtian Church, to which alone the Promiſes of Salvation are made. And whereas a late Author thinks to evade the force of this Argument by obſerving that our Saviour adds, *But he that believeth not ſhall be damned,*

Separation yet no Schiſm. p. 9.

*damned*, Mark 16.16, So that *men ſhall be damned meerly upon account of their unbelief, and not meerly for want of baptiſm, provided they have faith*: It is on the contrary very evident that no ſuch thing can be concluded from our Saviours words: He firſt lays down the terms of Salvation, Faith, and Baptiſm, and methinks thoſe men make very bold with our Saviour, who affirm, that we may be *ordinarily ſaved* (for our Saviour ſpeaks here of ordinary caſes) without Baptiſm; but then he adds, who ſhall be damned, and they are Unbelievers of two ſorts: ſuch Infidels as refuſe Baptiſm, and ſuch unbelievers as are baptized: So that *he that believeth not, ſhall be damned*, ſignifies, that though Faith and Baptiſm be neceſſary to Salvation, yet unbelief alone whether men be baptized or not ſhall damn them: For I would ask this Author, whether ſuppoſing that our Saviour had deſigned in thoſe words, *He that believeth, and is baptized, ſhall be ſaved*, to ſignifie, that Faith and Baptiſm were both neceſſary to Salvation, it had been proper for him to have added, *but he that believeth not*, and is not baptized, *ſhall be damned*: which would have damned only unbaptized Infidels, and have given too great reaſon to

baptized hypocrites and unbelievers to hope for ſalvation.

But to return to Mr. *Ferguſon*, his ſecond Argument is this, *That Chriſtians may be obliged upon their loyalty to Chriſt to renounce Communion, not only with the particular Church with which they have walked, but to ſuſpend fellowſhip with any particular Church, that lies within the circle and compaſs of their knowledge.* If there be a juſt cauſe for this, it will be their vindication, and this will not prejudice their union to the inviſible Catholick Church; But I hope all good Chriſtians will be more wary of this than our Author and his Friends are, for humour, and frowardneſs, and intereſt will not juſtifie a ſeparation.

His third Argument is of the ſame nature, and needs no other anſwer, *That Chriſtians may be injuriouſly caſt out of the Communion, not only of one, but of every particular Church, and yet remain united to Chriſt*: If they be injuriouſly caſt out, it ſhall be no prejudice to them, for Chriſt will reverſe all unjuſt Sentences; ſuch men are ſtill united to Chriſt, and therefore are united to his body, the Catholick inviſible Church: But what he adds, *that a man may be juſtly ſecluded for a time from communion with any particular Church, and yet his*

*his union to Chriſt not be diſſolved*: Though it make nothing againſt me, for if he be ſtill united to Chriſt, he is united to the Catholick Church, though ſecluded from the Communion of the viſible Church; yet it is directly contrary to the ſenſe of all antiquity, and makes the cenſures of the Church vain and uſeleſs things: What is the meaning of that authority our Saviour hath granted to his Apoſtles and Miniſters, *whatſoever you bind on earth ſhall be bound in heaven, and whatſoever you looſe on earth, ſhall be looſed in heaven*; if they may bind, and Chriſt looſe, if they may *juſtly* ſeparate men from the body of Chriſt, and yet Chriſt keep them united to himſelf? which I fear muſt be unjuſtly done, if the other be juſtly; unleſs he will ſay, that the Church may juſtly ſeparate men from Chriſt, & Chriſt juſtly keep them united to himſelf. All Divines indeed grant, that whatever is done *errante clave* through ignorance and miſtake, or for ſome worſe reaſons, is rectified by Chriſt; but to ſay that Chriſt makes void the juſt and regular Cenſures of his Church, is expreſly contrary to his declared will, and is in effect to repeal and countermand that authority which he has left in his Church: and therefore ſo far as any man is juſtly

ſeparated from the Church, he is ſeparated from Chriſt too, and cannot regularly be reſtored again but by the ſame authority. But I ſuppoſe Mr. *Ferguſon* (and he has ſome reaſon for it) is of Mr. *Watſon's* mind, *That neither Sin nor Satan can diſſolve our Union with Chriſt*, and then I know no reaſon, why it ſhould diſſolve our Union with the Church neither.

His fourth Argument is, *That none are to be received under the notion of members into a particular Church, but upon a preſumption that Chriſt hath received them.* But it is ſufficient, if they be ſuch as Chriſt will receive and own, when they are incorporated into his Church; and indeed Mr. *Ferguſon's* way is down-right nonſenſe. For Chriſt's *receiving* men is his admiſſion of them into his Church, as members of his body, and if Chriſt muſt receive them, firſt he muſt own them for members of his Church, before they are members of his Church, and no man is fit to be admitted as a member of the Church, before he be a member of the Church: As for what he adds, that men muſt firſt be Believers before they be admitted members of the Church, is very true, but Faith only does not make them Chriſtians, as I ſhewed above.

His

His fifth Argument is, *That it is a Perſons ſubmitting himſelf to the Laws and Authority of Chriſt, which ſwayeth and influenceth him to ſubmit to Paſtors and Teachers, and to joyn with others in the fellowſhip of the Goſpel; and by conſequence our union with a particular Church is ſo far from being the bond of our Union with the Lord Jeſus, that on the contrary our Union with him is the motive and inducement of our joyning into fellowſhip with a particular Church.* This is ſo far from being true, that on the contrary we have no viſible way of ſubmitting to the Authority of Chriſt, but by ſubmitting our ſelves to that Authority and Government, which he hath left in his Church: For Chriſt does not govern us now as a viſible head, but by the Miniſtry of men, whom he hath inveſted with authority for that purpoſe. The belief of Chriſt's Power and Authority is the reaſon of our ſubjection to the Church, but we do not actually ſubmit to the Authority of Chriſt on earth, but by our actual ſubjection to the Church, as I ſhewed above in the fourth Propoſition. As for his proof from the example of the *Churches of the Macedonians, that they firſt gave themſelves to the Lord, and then unto them* (the Apoſtles) *by the will of God*, 2 Cor. 8. 5. Which he thus expounds,

*That it was by taking upon them the obſervance of Chriſts commands, that they found themſelves obliged to coaleſce into Church Societies*; it is a famous example of our Author's skill or honeſty in expounding Scriptures; for the Apoſtle ſpeaks nothing there of Church Societies, or the reaſon of their entring into them, which was no diſpute in thoſe days, when Independency was not yet hatched; but he commends the bounty and charity of the *Macedonians* in contributing to the neceſſities of the poor Saints, and their great forwardneſs to it, that they did not need to be ſtirred up by the Apoſtles to ſo good a work, but on the contrary earneſtly *intreated them to receive the gift, and take upon them the fellowſhip of the miniſtring to the Saints*. And the account the Apoſtle gives of it is this, that they firſt gave up themſelves and all they had to the ſervice of Chriſt, and then committed their liberal contributions into their hands to be diſpoſed of for the propagation of the Goſpel, and the relief of the Saints. This was the commendation of their charity, that it was not the effect of importunate ſolicitations, but of hearts entirely devoted to Chriſt and the ſervice of the Church: though ἑαυτὲς ἔδωκαν πρῶτον τῷ Κυρίῳ καὶ ἡμῖν, doth not

not ſignifie, that they firſt gave themſelves to the Lord, and then to us, but they firſt gave themſelves to the Lord and to us, his Apoſtles, who are inveſted with his Authority, and then expreſſed their bounty and liberality to the poor Chriſtians.

His laſt Argument is, *That an imagination of our being united to Chriſt by the mediation of an Union with the Church, ſeems to have been the foundation of the Papal Vicarious Political Head:* But pray how ſo? Becauſe I aſſert, that Chriſt is the Head of the Church, which is his body, and that he is a head only to his body, and therefore, that none can be united to Chriſt as their head without being members of his body, therefore there muſt be *a Papal Vicarious Political Head?* I muſt now do as M. *Ferguſon* does, deny the conſequent, for I am ſure there is no conſequence in it. He imagines that our Union to Chriſt, and our Union to the Church, are two diſtinct Unions, and therefore if we are united to Chriſt by our Union to the Church, there ought to be a Univerſal Vicarious Head on earth, to whom we may be united: Whereas we are united to no head but Chriſt, and we are united to this Head, as all members are, by our Union to his body, which is his Church: To be united

ted to a Vicarious Head in order to our Union to the Real Head, if it be not ſenſeleſs and ridiculous, yet is founded neither on reaſon, nor Scripture, nor any analogy or reſemblance in nature; but to be united to the body that we may be united to the head is neceſſary in order of nature; for no member is any other ways united to the head but by its Union to the body: The whole Church is the body of Chriſt, and Apoſtles, and Prophets, and Biſhops, are but members of this body, though of greater uſe, dignity, and authority than meaner Chriſtians; as in the natural body ſome members are more honourable and uſeful than the reſt. But who told Mr. *Ferguſon that Chriſt is not the immediate Political Head of his Church*, and that therefore there *muſt be a Vicarious Head*? He repreſents this as my opinion, though I never ſaid ſo, nor thought ſo: I have ſaid indeed, that particular Chriſtians are not immediately united to the perſon of Chriſt, but are united to Chriſt by their Union to his Church: But it does not hence follow, that Chriſt is not the immediate Head of every Chriſtian, much leſs that he is not the immediate head of his whole Church: except he will ſay, that the Head in the natural

natural body is not the immediate head of the body, and of every member in it, because the hand and the foot are not immediately joyned to it.

These are Mr. *Ferguson's* Arguments to prove, that we are not united to Christ by being united to the Christian Church, most of which he alleadges also upon another occasion to prove, *That one living in the Fellowship and Communion of no visible Church may be a Christian* (which was the avowed Doctrine of *Socinus*) by this we may guess, what weight he laid upon them, and I am not at leisure to repeat my answers, as often as he repeats his Arguments, but dare venture them at one proposal against his frequent repetitions. p.469.

And therefore to proceed, among other Arguments whereby I confirmed that Notion, *that our Union to Christ consists in our Union to the Christian Church.* I argued from the nature of the two Sacraments, Baptism, and the Lords Supper, which our Saviour has appointed, as Symbols of our Union with him. Our first undertaking of Christianity is represented in our Baptism, wherein we make a publick profession of our faith in Christ, and solemnly vow obedience to him, and it is sufficiently known, that Baptism is the Sacrament of our admission into the Christian Church. Now

P. 615. Now in anſwer to this Mr. *Ferguſon* tells us, 1. *That Baptiſm is neither the medium of our Union with the Catholick viſible Church, nor that whereby we become members of a particular inſtituted Church.* I hope our Author will not here too challenge me with contradicting the Church of *England*, which ſo expreſly teaches us, that in our Baptiſm, *we were made the members of Chriſt, the Children of God*, &c. I obſerved before, that Baptiſm admits us into the Catholick Church viſible or inviſible, and admits us into particular Churches as members of the Univerſal Church, which ſignifies no more, than that by virtue of our being members of the Univerſal Church, we have a right, and are under an Obligation to viſible Communion with any particular Church, wherein we live, if there be no juſt and neceſſary cauſe to hinder it.

Let us hear now how Mr. *Ferguſon* diſproves this: he tells us, that Baptiſm is not the *medium of our Union with the Catholick viſible Church*, he ſhould ſay the Rite and Ceremony of our admiſſion and incorporation into the Church, *foraſmuch as a perſon may be of the Univerſal viſible Church, and yet not be baptized.* How does he prove this? Becauſe *there have been many who*

(*partly*

*(partly through want of opportunity to enjoy the Ordinance of Baptiſm, partly through other motives, though they are not juſtifiable) have denied themſelves the mercy of the Baptiſmal Laver, and yet to ſuppoſe that thereupon they are not Chriſtians, is to renounce all exerciſe of charity, and to involve our ſelves under the guilt of condemning thoſe whom the Lord hath received,* in which Argument there are almoſt as many abſurdities as words. He attempts to diſprove the received Doctrine of the Church by a judgment of charity, ſo that if a man will not be very charitable his Argument is worth nothing; and indeed his Arguments do as often need the exerciſe of charity, as moſt I ever met with: And yet in the next breath he charges thoſe with guilt, *who condemn them whom the Lord hath received*: But if Gods receiving them be only a judgment of charity, how comes he to be ſo ſure of it as to pronounce, that the Lord hath received them, and to condemn all thoſe who deny it, without offering the leaſt word to prove it? But ſuppoſe that we are ſo charitable as to hope that God may receive them, yet how does this make them members of the *Catholick viſible Church?* To be ſure they are not *viſible* members of any Church, for if they were they would

not

not need the judgment of charity to make them ſo, and if they be not viſible members, they cannot be members of the viſible Church: Thoſe who want the opportunities of Baptiſm, cannot be members of the viſible Church, for it is ſuppoſed they do not live where there is any viſible Church, otherwiſe they might have the opportunity of Baptiſm; and thoſe who refuſe to be baptized upon unjuſtifiable reaſons, certainly were never received into the Catholick viſible Church, (which never owns any members but thoſe who are baptized) though they may be entertained in private Clans and Conventicles.

But is not this a pretty Argument againſt Baptiſm being the regular way, which Chriſt hath appointed for our admiſſion into his Church, becauſe there are ſome few favourable caſes, which require the exerciſe of our charity, to hope that God may be merciful to them who are not baptized; whereas this very ſuppoſition, that it requires the judgment of Charity is a plain acknowledgment, that Baptiſm is the regular way of making men Chriſtians, and that there is ſome reaſon of doubt, whether Chriſt will own them members of his Church who are not baptized.

All

All Divines of any note tell us, that where men want the opportunity of Baptiſm, Baptiſm *in voto*, in our wiſh, and deſire, and purpoſe, will be accepted; as for thoſe who deny themſelves the mercy of Baptiſm upon unjuſtifiable grounds, we muſt leave them to the ſecret judgment of God; they have not the ordinary title to the Promiſes of the New Covenant, and what extraordinary mercy God will vouchſafe to them who reject the ordinary methods of grace no man can tell.

His Arguments whereby he proves, that Baptiſm does not admit us into a particular inſtituted Church, are firſt becauſe *it is poſſible that a perſon may be baptized where there are not enough to form any particular inſtituted Church*: What of that? May it not confer a right, and lay an obligation to Communion with a particular Church, when we come where it is? Which is all that is meant by our admiſſion into a particular Church by Baptiſm: Well, *but it may ſometimes be found neceſſary to deny the Priviledges of Memberſhip in an inſtituted Church, even to ſuch as have been baptized*: That is, if they be found forging of bonds, or guilty of any other ſcandalous ſin, they may be cenſured and excommunicated; and

and who ever denied this? Nay, is not this an Argument that Baptiſm admits them into the Church, becauſe ſuch perſons only are ſubject to the Cenſures of it? And how they can be caſt out of the Church, I know not, except they were in it: The ſum of this Argument is this, That Baptiſm does not admit us into the Church, becauſe baptized perſons, living diſorderly, may be caſt out of it.

But *there were baptized Chriſtians before any particular Churches were erected.* Be it ſo; then they were members of the Univerſal Church, and thereby qualified to be members of a particular Church, when there ſhould be one.

Secondly he proves, that we are not admitted into the Church by Baptiſm, becauſe *none ought to be admitted to Baptiſm, but thoſe who are antecedently judged to be Chriſtians*: For which he quotes *Acts* 8. 37. where *Philip* tells the Eunuch, that if he believed he might be baptized: it ſeems he knows no difference between a Believer and a Chriſtian, but I have taken notice of this already. Faith is neceſſary to our Baptiſm, and to qualifie us to be admitted into the Church; but beſides this, an actual incorporation into the Church by Baptiſm is neceſſary to make

us

us Christians, and to entitle us to the Priviledges of Christs body.

In his third and fourth Propositions he designs to say something against me, but I cannot imagine what it is. He tells us, *That our submitting to the Ordinance and Institution of Baptism, is a visible profession of our owning the Authority of Christ*: So say I too; it is such a profession of our subjection to Christ, as Christ hath made necessary to our incorporation into his Church: But we must own the Authority of Christ, before we can make this profession of owning it. Right, we must believe Christ to be Lord and Saviour, but this alone does not make us Christians, unless we make such a profession of it, and be admitted into the Church by such publick Rites and Ceremonies as Christ hath made necessary to that end. The consent of both Parties is necessary to a Marriage, but this alone will not make the Marriage without such a publick solemnization of it as is required by the Laws of Countries: For when there is a legal way appointed for declaring our consent, no Government takes notice of any consent, till it be declared in Form of Law.

Our Author tells us, *That Baptism is both a Badg and Symbol of our Profession, and a*

*Bond and Obligation upon us, to diſcharge the duties, which our Profeſſion of Chriſtianity calls us to.* And it is ſo by a perpetual Inſtitution: Now if we conſider the nature of a Covenant, which requires ſealing on both ſides, it will appear, that this Ceremony is eſſentially neceſſary to our admiſſion into the Goſpel Covenant, (or which is all one, to our admiſſion into the Chriſtian Church) God hath ſealed to us in the Death of his Son, whereby he has confirmed and ratified the Goſpel Covenant, but till we ſeal to him in Baptiſm, no previous faith and conſent can give us a title to the benefits of the Covenant.

In his fourth Propoſition he tells us, *That the Union of the Catholick viſible Church, conſiſting in a joynt profeſſion of the ſame Lord, Faith, and Baptiſm, there doth therefore upon a perſons ſubmitting to the Ordinance of Baptiſm, ſuch a relation to the whole Catholick viſible Church emerge, as that he is rendered a compleat member of the Church, under the notion of Catholick viſible:* And adds, *So far is our Union with the viſible Church by means of Baptiſm, from being the medium of our Union to Chriſt, that it is our dedicating our ſelves to Chriſt by this auguſt Ceremony, which conſtitutes us complete members of the Church under the*

*notion*

*notion of visible.* He tells us, that Baptism makes us members of the Catholick Church, so say I: But it makes us members of the Catholick Church by dedicating us to Christ, so say I too; and therefore *our Union with the Visible Church by means of Baptism is not the medium of our Union to Christ*: But how does this follow, when Baptism dedicates us to Christ, not as single Individuals, but as members of his body, that is his Church? For that which dedicates us to Christ as members of his body, unites us to Christ by uniting us to the Church: But Baptism makes us *compleat members*, whereby he would insinuate, that we were members before, though incomplete; but this he ought to have proved, which he has not yet, and never can do: And indeed a complete, and incomplete member seems to be no very good sense; for the same relation admits of no degrees; one Child under the notion of a Child is as completely the Fathers Child as any other of his Children are; and if we be indeed members of the Church, that is united and related to the Church, we are complete members; for what ever makes us members, makes us members, and we cannot be more or less members: A member may be

ſound or rotten, weak or ſtrong, and upon that ſcore may be a perfect, or imperfect member; but conſidering only the relation of memberſhip, which is the preſent caſe, every member is as much a member as any other.

But Baptiſm makes us complete members of the Church only under the notion of *Catholick viſible*; How comes this to paſs now? When in his firſt Propoſition, he would by no means allow, that Baptiſm united us to the *Univerſal viſible Church*; and yet here it makes us complete members of the Church under the notion of viſible: How will he anſwer his own Argument? That men were baptized before there was any particular viſible Church formed, and if there were no particular viſible Church, certainly there could be no Catholick viſible Church neither: Unleſs we can imagine, that there may be a Kingdom, which conſiſts of a great many ſubordinate Societies, and Corporations, and Families, before there is ſo much as any one Family.

Baptiſm admits us into the Church of Chriſt under the notion of Chriſt's body, not under the notion of viſible or inviſible, unleſs we think, that the Covenant of Grace, and all the Promiſes of it, which

which are ſealed to us in Baptiſm, be made only to the Church under the notion of viſible: and then I ſhall not blame the Church of *Rome* for making Viſibility one mark of the true Church.

But to proceed, I argued alſo from the nature of the Lords Supper, which is a Sacrament, and Symbol of our Union to Chriſt and Fellowſhip with him after we are incorporated into his Church, and ſignifies and repreſents that near conjunction which is between Chriſt and the Chriſtian Church, and the mutual Fellowſhip of one Chriſtian with another, as members of the ſame body. Which is a plain Argument, that Chriſt owns us, not as ſingle Individuals, but as members of his body, as incorporated into the Chriſtian Church.

To this Mr. *Ferguſon* anſwers: 1. *The Supper of the Lord, though a Sacrament of Union, yet it cannot be the firſt medium of our Union to the Church, ſeeing none have a right to it, but ſuch as are already Church members.* p. 619. Nor did I ever ſay it was the *firſt medium*, but that it repreſents that near conjunction which is between Chriſt and the Chriſtian Church, and every particular Chriſtian, as incorporated into the Church; *For as the Apoſtle ſays,* (to uſe our Authors

p.626. own words in another place) *ſeeing it's one loaf* (ἓις ἄρτος) *of which we partake, we are therefore one body* (viz. *in Chriſt*) *who participate of that one loaf*, 1 Cor. 10. 17. Pichorellus *well obſerves, that Paul doth not ſay, we are one loaf or bread, (though our Tranſlation renders it ſo) but that he argues from the Coalition of the cluſters of the ſmall corpuſcles of meal* (ſurely our Author was taught this bombaſt by the School maſter in Sir *Philip Sidney*) *of which a Loaf is kneaded and contexed to the identity and oneneſs, that intervenes between Chriſt and Believers,* (intervening identity and oneneſs is a great elegancy.) But our Author ſeems to have abuſed *Pichorellus* not only in a phantaſtical Tranſlation of his words, but in perverting the ſenſe of them, whoſe words, as he has ſet them in the margin, are theſe: *Non dicit Paulus fideles unum eſſe panem, ſed ab uno pane ducit ſimilitudinem*: Paul *does not ſay, that all Believers are one bread, but takes a ſimilitude and reſemblance from one bread*; What to do? To prove the oneneſs and identity, which *intervenes* between Chriſt, and ſingle Believers? as Mr. *Ferguſon* would repreſent it; no, but to prove that near alliance and conjunction which is between the whole body of Believers, which are as cloſely compacted into one body,

as

as the ſeveral particles of flour are, when they are kneaded into one Loaf, and ſo as one body are united to Chriſt, and entertained at his Table. Agreeably to St. *Chryſoſtoms* account of the words, as they are tranſlated alſo by our Author, *What is that Loaf? It is the body of Chriſt. What are thoſe who partake of it? They are the body of Chriſt, not many bodies, but one. For as the many grains of which a loaf is formed, are ſo convened into one maſs* (mighty elegant ſtill) *that the diſtinction and diverſity one from another doth not appear.* Οὕτω καὶ ἀλλήλοις, καὶ τῷ Χριστῷ ζωπλόμεθα, *in the ſame manner are we conjoyned to Chriſt, and one another*; or according to the order of St. *Chryſoſtoms* words, to one another and to Chriſt: So that though this holy Supper be not the firſt medium of our Union to the Church, yet it repreſents the Union of the Chriſtian Church, and of all particular Chriſtians in it, in one body to Chriſt, which was all I deſigned to prove by it.

In the ſecond place he tells us, *That by the Lords Supper we ratifie our perſeverance, and renew our engagements of being the Lords.* And thirdly, *That it is a Symbol of our Union to Chriſt and to each other.* And ſo we are very well agreed, and it is time to give over this Diſpute.

Thus I have brought off my two firſt Propoſitions ſafe and ſound, but before I proceed to the reſt, I muſt remove a rub or two which Mr. *Ferguſon* has thrown in my way: For he charges me with denying our Union to the *Perſon of Chriſt*, and our *immediate* Union to his Perſon; and this indeed I do in ſome ſenſe, and if he had been either an honeſt man, or a fair Diſputant, he ought to have declared in what ſenſe I diſowned it; but inſtead of this he fills ſeveral Pages with long and ſenſeleſs Harangues to prove, that we muſt be united to the Perſon of Chriſt, and that it would have been as conſiſtent with my deſign to own, as to deny it, when indeed I never denied it, but expreſly owned it, in that ſenſe which he would now contend for: And to give a plain demonſtration of the honeſty and ingenuity of this Author, I ſhall tranſcribe one Page out of my former Diſcourſe, which concerns this matter. "The deſign of all "theſe diſtinctions is to prove the Union "of Perſons between Chriſt and Belie- "vers, and becauſe I find this Author "hath bewildred himſelf, I will endea- "vour to help him out; for it is a very "plain caſe, if Chriſt and Believers are "united, their Perſons muſt be united "too:

Know-ledge of Chriſt. p. 200.

"too: For the Perſon of Chriſt is Chriſt "himſelf, and the Perſons of Believers "are Believers themſelves; and I cannot "underſtand how they can be united "without their Perſons, that is, without "themſelves: But then they are united "by mutual relations as the Perſon of a "Prince and of his Subjects, of a Huſ-"band and his Wife are united, or by "mutual affections, or common intereſt, "not by a natural adheſion of Perſons: "But becauſe I find it does not ſatisfie "theſe men, that Chriſt and Believers "are united, unleſs their Perſons be uni-"ted too, it makes me ſuſpect, that "there is a greater Myſtery in this Union "of Perſons than every one apprehends. Upon this I conſidered what they meant by the Perſon of Chriſt, and our Union to him: So that I do not *impeach them, for not being ſatisfied, that Chriſt and Believers are united unleſs their Perſons be united too*, as Mr. *Ferguſon* repreſents it, but from their making ſuch a difference between our Union to Chriſt, and our Union to his Perſon, I reaſonably concluded, that they meant ſomething more by our Union to the Perſon of Chriſt than every one was aware of; and ſo indeed I found it, as appears from what I diſcourſed in that place.

Intereſt of Reaſon, &c. p. 499.

And

And to give as ſhort and perſpicuous an account of it as poſſibly I can here: I obſerve, that by the *Perſon of Chriſt* to which we are united, they mean *ſuch a Perſon, as has done all for us, and hath undertaken to do all in us*: And by an immediate Union to this Perſon; they mean at moſt an immediate application of themſelves to his Perſon by reliance and recumbency, which gives them an intereſt in all that Chriſt has done and ſuffered, by vertue of an Union to his Perſon.

Firſt, By the Perſon of Chriſt to which we are united, they mean ſuch a Perſon as has done all for us, and has undertaken to do all in us. As for the latter part of this, that Chriſt hath undertaken to do all in us: I ſhall reſerve it to be conſidered under the head of *Political Union*, and ſhall at preſent confine my Diſcourſe to his having done all for us. This is their notion of Chriſt's being our Surety and Mediator, that in our ſtead he hath ſatisfied the juſtice of God, and fulfilled all righteouſneſs, and that we are made righteous by his Perſonal Righteouſneſs, which he performed in his own Perſon, but in our ſtead, and as repreſenting us: And I ſhould wonder that Mr. *Ferguſon* denies this, but that I now know him too well

to

to wonder at any thing he ſays. For Doctor *Jacomb* has induſtriouſly endeavoured to prove this notion of Chriſts being our Surety to do all in our ſtead; and Dr. *Owen* hath with as great endeavours, and with like ſucceſs, attempted to prove this from Chriſts being our Mediator: But how far either the notion of a Surety, or of a Mediator is from countenancing any ſuch Doctrine, I have made abundantly evident in my former Diſcourſe, to which Mr. *Ferguſon* replies nothing, but entertains and amuſes his Readers with ſome School-pedantry in the derivation of the words ἔγγυος and Μεσίτης, which he learnedly obſerves comes ἀπὸ τοῦ μέσου. But to leave theſe little Criticiſms to School-boys; and to reduce the Controverſie into a ſhort compaſs, the fundamental miſtake is this, that they repreſent Chriſt as a Surety and Mediator for ſome particular men, not as the Surety and Mediator of the Covenant. I made it appear, that though we ſhould grant, that Chriſt is called a Surety and Mediator, with reſpect to his undertaking for ſome particular perſons, yet they cannot reaſonably argue from the notion of a Surety and Mediator to prove, that Chriſt fulfilled all righteouſneſs for thoſe, and in their

Knowledge of Chriſt, Chap. 4. Sect. 3.

their ſtead, whoſe Surety and Mediator he was; and, as I have obſerved above, my Adverſaries have been forced to quit this way of arguing from the general notion of a Surety and Mediator among men: But indeed the foundation of this notion is falſe, that Chriſt did undertake for particular perſons, to do all for them, which was required of them, by vertue of any Law, as Dr. *Owen* repreſents it.

Chriſt by his death made a general Atonement and Expiation for Sin, and with his Blood procured, purchaſed, and ſealed the Covenant of Grace, wherein God promiſes pardon of Sin and Eternal Life to thoſe who believe and obey the Goſpel; and thus his bloud is *the bloud of the Covenant*, and he is the *Surety and Mediator of the Covenant*: But that what Chriſt did and ſuffered, he ſhould do in the name and ſtead only of ſome particular Perſons, as their Surety, Proxy, Surrogate, or Subſtitute, has not the leaſt foundation in Scripture, and is the firſt cauſe, and the only ſupport of the *Antinomian* Hereſie.

Mr. *Ferguſon* founds Chriſt's Suretiſhip on the *Covenant of Redemption*, that is, on that Covenant, which ſome modern Divines ſo much talk of, between God

the

the Father, and Chriſt concerning the Salvation of the Elect: that God the Father gives ſo many perſons by name to Chriſt, to be ſaved by him, and upon his voluntary undertaking that work, he ſtands in the room and ſtead of thoſe men, and does and ſuffers what ever was required of them, acting for them as a common perſon: that God imputes all their Sins to Chriſt, and imputes his Righteouſneſs to them, and reckons it as much theirs as if it had been perſonally performed by them: Gods appointing of Chriſt to this work, and his accepting of it, puts him into the room and ſtead of the Elect, and whatever is done by him as their Surety and Mediator, is reckoned as done by them. If this could be proved, it were ſomewhat to the purpoſe, but if no ſuch thing appear, as Chriſt's acting in the name and ſtead of any particular men, this utterly ſubverts their notion of Suretiſhip: For a Surety, or Proxy, or Surrogate, or what ever you will call him, who acts in the name and ſtead of others, ſo that what he does, is reckoned as done by thoſe for whom he acts, muſt do what he does in the name, and representing the perſons of ſome certain particular men. For to act in the name and

ſtead

their ſtead, whoſe Surety and Mediator he was; and, as I have obſerved above, my Adverſaries have been forced to quit this way of arguing from the general notion of a Surety and Mediator among men: But indeed the foundation of this notion is falſe, that Chriſt did undertake for particular perſons, to do all for them, which was required of them, by vertue of any Law, as Dr. *Owen* repreſents it.

Chriſt by his death made a general Atonement and Expiation for Sin, and with his Blood procured, purchaſed, and ſealed the Covenant of Grace, wherein God promiſes pardon of Sin and Eternal Life to thoſe who believe and obey the Goſpel; and thus his bloud is *the bloud of the Covenant*, and he is the *Surety and Mediator of the Covenant*: But that what Chriſt did and ſuffered, he ſhould do in the name and ſtead only of ſome particular Perſons, as their Surety, Proxy, Surrogate, or Subſtitute, has not the leaſt foundation in Scripture, and is the firſt cauſe, and the only ſupport of the *Antinomian* Hereſie.

Mr. *Ferguſon* founds Chriſt's Suretiſhip on the *Covenant of Redemption*, that is, on that Covenant, which ſome modern Divines ſo much talk of, between God

the

the Father, and Chriſt concerning the Salvation of the Elect: that God the Father gives ſo many perſons by name to Chriſt, to be ſaved by him, and upon his voluntary undertaking that work, he ſtands in the room and ſtead of thoſe men, and does and ſuffers what ever was required of them, acting for them as a common perſon: that God imputes all their Sins to Chriſt, and imputes his Righteouſneſs to them, and reckons it as much theirs as if it had been perſonally performed by them: Gods appointing of Chriſt to this work, and his accepting of it, puts him into the room and ſtead of the Elect, and whatever is done by him as their Surety and Mediator, is reckoned as done by them. If this could be proved, it were ſomewhat to the purpoſe, but if no ſuch thing appear, as Chriſt's acting in the name and ſtead of any particular men, this utterly ſubverts their notion of Suretiſhip: For a Surety, or Proxy, or Surrogate, or what ever you will call him, who acts in the name and ſtead of others, ſo that what he does, is reckoned as done by thoſe for whom he acts, muſt do what he does in the name, and as repreſenting the perſons of ſome certain particular men. For to act in the name and ſtead

ſtead of another in this ſenſe, and yet not to repreſent any certain perſon, is a contradiction.

I do not deny, but that Chriſt may properly be ſaid to die in our ſtead, *loco noſtro & vice noſtrâ*, in as much as his Death was a proper Expiatory Sacrifice for Sin, or as *Grotius* explains that Phraſe, *Vice noſtra Chriſtum eſſe mortuum, hoc eſt, niſi Chriſtus eſſet mortuus, nos fuiſſe morituros, & quia Chriſtus mortuus eſt, nos non morituros morte æterna; That Chriſt is ſaid to die in our ſtead, becauſe unleſs Chriſt had died, we muſt have died, and ſince Chriſt hath died, we ſhall not die an Eternal death. De ſatiſf. Cap. 9.* But then Chriſt did not ſo die in our ſtead, much leſs fulfil Righteouſneſs in our ſtead, as to perſonate us, as our Subſtitute, Attorney, or Proxy, and the difference between theſe two is vaſtly wide: for in the firſt Caſe, Chriſt only ſo dies in our ſtead, that in virtue of his Expiation and Sacrifice he procures, confirms, and ratifies, a Univerſal Covenant of Grace with mankind upon certain terms, and conditions to be performed by us; hence his bloud is called the bloud of the Covenant, and he the Surety of the Covenant: But for Chriſt to act in our ſtead, ſo as to repreſent and perſonate us, gives us

us an immediate actual right to the purchaſe of Chriſt's Death, and to the merit of his Righteouſneſs; for what is thus done in our ſtead, is in Law and Juſtice reckoned as done by us, and therefore can admit of no intervening condition to intitle us to it. In the firſt ſenſe Chriſt may die for all mankind, and be a propitiation for the ſins of the whole World, and the Sacrifice and Expiation of his Death be very well reconciled with a conditional Covenant. But in the ſecond ſenſe he can be ſaid to die for none, but thoſe particular men, whoſe perſons he repreſented as their Surety and Proxy; and who have an immediate right to what ever he has done and ſuffered for no other reaſon, but becauſe he acted in their name and ſtead: Which reſolves the whole Covenant of Grace between God and man into the Covenant of Redemption, as they call it, between God and Chriſt.

Mr. *Ferguſon* has a great mind to ſay ſomething againſt this notion of Chriſt's being the Surety and Mediator of the Covenant; and not ſuch a Surety and Mediator for particular perſons as acts in their name and ſtead, and does for them what ever was required of them by any Law.

Intereſt of Reaſon, &c. p. 540.

Law. He firſt excepts againſt my Notion of a *Surety of a Covenant, that it ſignifies no more than to confirm and ratifie this Covenant, and to undertake for the performance of it, that all the Promiſes of the Covenant ſhall be made good upon ſuch terms and conditions as are annexed to them.* And firſt he would fain inſinuate the charge of *Socinianiſm* againſt it, though he confeſſes, that *both* Grotius *and Dr. Hammond go this way*, but yet my *Paraphraſe hath more affinity to* Schlichtingius's *Gloſs, than to either of theirs*, which is ſaid with the uſual ingenuity of our Authour, without any pretence or ſhew of reaſon: For there is nothing in my Paraphraſe like *Schlichtingius's*, which I had never ſeen. As he has ſet it down in the Margin, *Schlichtingius's* Comment is this: *Sponſor fœderis appellatur Ieſus, quod nomine Dei nobis ſpoſponderit* i.e. *fidem fecerit Deum fœderis promiſſiones ſervaturum eſſe, non verò quaſi pro nobis ſpoſponderit Deo, noſtrorumve delictorum ſolutionem in ſe receperit. That Jeſus is therefore called the Surety of the Covenant, becauſe he hath promiſed us in Gods name, that God ſhall keep and perform the Promiſes of the Covenant, not that he undertook for us to God, by taking upon himſelf the diſcharge of our debts, or ſins*; That is, by making Atonement and ſatisfaction for ſin. Which

Which is ſo far from being my ſenſe, that it is directly contrary to it.

For when I ſay, that Chriſt's being the *Surety of the Covenant*, ſignifies his confirming and ratifying the Covenant, and undertaking for the performance of it, under thoſe Phraſes of confirming and ratifying, I include whatever Chriſt did in order to the full and complete ratification of the Covenant, and had a principal regard to that Expiation and Atonement which he made for ſin, which was the procuring cauſe of the Covenant of Grace, and the Seal and ratification of it: For thus Covenants were confirmed by Sacrifices in the Eaſtern Countries. Thus *Moſes* confirmed the Covenant between God and the people of *Iſrael*, *by ſprinkling the book and all the people* with the bloud of the Sacrifice, *ſaying, this is the bloud of the Teſtament, which God hath ordained to you*, *Heb* 9.19,20,21. Upon which account *the bloud of Chriſt is called the bloud of ſprinkling too, becauſe by his bloud God did ſeal and confirm the Covenant of Grace, as the ſprinkling the bloud of beaſts did confirm the Moſaical Covenant*, as I expreſly obſerved in my former Diſcourſe, from whence Mr. *Ferguſon* might have learned what I meant by confirming and ratifying the Covenant. Knowledge of Chriſt. p. 321.

Now this alone anſwers all Mr. *Ferguſon's* Objections againſt my Notion of a *Surety of a Covenant*. He tells us, that *the Surety of a better Teſtament, and Mediator of a better Covenant are equipollent* terms, (though he produces no other reaſon for it, but that Chriſt is called a Surety in one place, and Mediator in another, whereas the notions ſeem to be ſomewhat different) and that his being ſtiled a Surety hath reſpect not to his Prophetical, but Sacerdotal Office; and what follows from hence? Why therefore Chriſt's being our Surety does not ſignifie his confirming and ratifying the Covenant, which had been an unanſwerable objection, had I attributed the confirmation of the Covenant to Chriſt only as Prophet, and not as Prieſt; but now proves nothing but our Authors great forwardneſs to anſwer Books before he underſtands them, or great skill in affixing perverſe ſenſes on them.

But Mr. *Ferguſon* has one extraordinary Argument to prove, *That there is nothing of ratifying the Covenant, and undertaking for the performance of it intended in the term of Suretiſhip*, becauſe *this ſhakes God's infinite veracity, which is the foundation of all Divine Faith. We may ſometimes queſtion, whether ſuch a declaration come from God, but admitting*

*ting once, that it is his, there is no room left to ſuſpect its being true*; and therefore Chriſt could not confirm the Covenant; For *Chriſt needed a teſtimony from God to confirm his miſſion, but God needed none from him to eſtabliſh his being true and unchangeable.* But he quite miſtakes the ſtate of the queſtion, for Chriſts confirmation of the Covenant is not his giving teſtimony to the truth and faithfulneſs of God, but ſuch a confirmation of the Covenant, as is made by a purchaſe, and by a Seal; which is an evidence to us that the Covenant is confirmed paſt all revocation, which no Covenant is, till the Seal is put to it; or to uſe the Apoſtles Argument from the nature of a Teſtament, which is not in force till the death of the Teſtator; which reaſon the Apoſtle aſſigns, why the firſt Teſtament was dedicated with bloud, and why this New Teſtament ſhould be dedicated, and confirmed, and ratified with the bloud of Chriſt, *Heb.* 9. 15, 16, *&c.* which gives a plain Anſwer to his other Argument, *That the Apoſtle reckoning up all the evidences of the Immutability of God's Counſel, hath omitted this, and thereby precluded it from the number of them.* Whereas in this very place the Apoſtle tells us, that this New Teſtament receives its

force and final confirmation from the death of Chriſt, who is the Teſtator. And whereas he adds, *Other ſecurity in order to our conſolation we need not, nor hath God thought fit to give any but his Promiſe and Oath*; and for this alleadges Gods Oath to *Abraham*, Heb.6.16,17. though we ſhould acknowledge, that God confirmed his Covenant and Promiſe to *Abraham* only by an Oath, yet it is as plain, that he has confirmed his Covenant with us by the Death of his Son; and indeed God ratified his Covenant with *Abraham* too by Sacrifice, and that at *Abraham's* requeſt, *Gen.*15.8,9,10, &c. And this Mr. *Ferguſon* at laſt acknowledges, *that the enacting of the Covenant of Grace* (which I ſuppoſe includes a final ratification of it) *reſpects Chriſt's undertaking to be made ſin, and to undergo the Curſe, as the moral cauſe and condition without which there had been no overtures of mercy made to the Sons of men*: And that upon this account is Chriſt called the Surety of the Covenant. This is a very dilute account of the Death of Chriſt, to make it only the condition *ſine quâ non*, without which God would not have made overtures of mercy: but he mends this in what follows, that *It was in conſequence of Chriſt's ſuſception to be our Sponſor, and with reſpect to the*

*the obedience of his life, and Sacrifice of his Death, as the procuring and deſerving cauſe that God entred into a Covenant with mankind*, &c. Which is no more than I always affirmed, excepting by *Sponſor* he means, that Chriſt did act in the name and ſtead of any particular men.

Having thus got rid of Mr. *Ferguſon's* Objections againſt my Notion of Chriſt's being the *Surety of the Covenant* (for what he diſcourſes of Chriſt's being a Mediator having nothing new in it, deſerves no particular conſideration) I come now to ſhew what neceſſity there is of rejecting that Notion *of Chriſts being a Surety and Mediator for particular perſons, to do for them in their name and ſtead, whatever was required of them by vertue of any Law*; and that in ſhort is this, that it is one of the firſt and fundamental Principles of *Antinomianiſm*, from which are deduced all thoſe pernicious Doctrines which alter the whole frame and deſign of Chriſtianity, and do naturally tend to debauchery and licentiouſneſs.

I ſhall give but ſome ſhort hints of this, becauſe the thing is ſufficiently evident and notorious. Thus from hence they argue, that the very ſins and iniquities of the Elect, and not only the guilt and

punishment of them, is laid on Christ, because he stands so in our stead, as to become just what we were: *Hast thou been an Idolater? Hast thou been a Blasphemer? Hast thou been a Murderer, an Adulterer, a Thief, a Liar, a Drunkard?* &c. *If thou hast a part in the Lord Christ, all these transgressions of thine become actually the transgressions of Christ, and so cease to be thine, and thou ceasest to be the transgressor, from that time they were laid upon Christ, to the last hour of thy life. Christ himself is not so completely righteous, but we are righteous as he was; nor we so completely sinful, but he became, being made sin, as completely sinful as we. So that here is a direct change, Christ takes our persons, and condition, and stands in our stead, we take Christs person, and condition, and stand in his stead; what the Lord beheld Christ to be, that he beholds the Members of Christ to be; what the Lord beholds the Members of Christ to be in themselves, that he beholds Christ himself to be.* This is very true arguing from this Principle, that Christ did to all intents and purposes stand in the stead, and represent the persons of particular men; and thus far Dr. *Owen* and Mr. *Ferguson* agree very well with Dr. *Crisp*.

*Crisp.* Christ alone exalted. Vol. 2. p. 88, 89.

But secondly, Dr. *Crisp* argues farther, *That every Transgression, first and last, great and*

*and ſmall, one with another, are carried away at once, and laid upon Chriſt*: Which is a neceſſary conſequence of the other; for if all our ſins were laid on Chriſt, and he took them away with one Sacrifice for ſin, then they muſt be taken away all together. *Whatever ſinfulneſs you have committed, do commit, or ſhall commit, there was one Sacrifice once offered by Chriſt, through which he hath perfected them that are ſanctified.* Ibid. p. 90, 91.

And thirdly, from hence it follows, that we are actually acquitted from the time of our ſins being laid upon Chriſt: For ſin cannot be laid upon Chriſt, and continue upon the ſinner too; and therefore from the time of ſins being laid upon Chriſt, the ſinner is acquitted and juſtified. But for the fuller explication of this, Dr. *Criſp* diſtinguiſhes between *God's laying Iniquity upon Chriſt by way of obligation, by way of execution, and by way of his own application of it to his people*; by way of obligation God did lay iniquity on Chriſt, *when he did tie, and bind, and oblige himſelf to it.* And *that is from all Eternity, then he did it in his own determinate Counſel, when in his own Counſel he did determine it ſhould be done.* But this was *a ſecret tie and obligation upon God, but God did lay the Iniquity of his people upon Chriſt openly, when he did openly bind himſelf by Cove-* Ibid. p. 244. p. 248.

*nant to do it*: *viz.* in that first Promise which he made to *Adam* after his Fall.

*But then God laid Iniquity on Christ by way of execution, as he in time served the execution upon Christ, which may be considered, as it was virtual, or as it was actual and real. The execution was served upon Christ in the virtue of it, from the first instant that ever there was a transgression committed, and not only at that time when sin was first committed, and from*
P. 254. *thence to the time of his suffering, but also afterwards from the time he had suffered to the end of the world.* For you must know that Christ was to bear the sins of the Elect from the beginning to the end of the world, and he was to discharge this debt at once, and therefore he does not actually do this, either at the beginning or at the end of the world; but *in the fulness of time Christ came and reckoned with the Father, and the Father hath so much of him for all that is past, and as much for all for after-times to*
P. 256. *the end of the world: Saith Christ to the Father, here is so much for every one of mine, that they have run out for the time that is past, and here is so much for every one of my Members that shall come after; they will commit so many sins in time to come, here is so much for all that sin they shall commit.* And this is Gods *serving execution actually upon Christ,*

when he died upon the Croſs in the fulneſs of time.

But thirdly, as *for Gods laying Iniquity upon Chriſt by way of particular application of it* to this and that man: You muſt obſerve, *That concerning the Elect in general, as they were in the eye of the Lord, before they had a real Exiſtence and Being, ſo all their Iniquities were laid upon Chriſt from Eternity; But the particular application of this grace to perſons muſt be in time,* and this done either ſecretly or manifeſtly. As for this ſecret application (which is ſo called, becauſe *it is a ſecret thing for a time to theſe for whom he does it*) *it is at the very inſtant that ſuch a perſon hath a being in the world*: the manifeſt application is, when the ſinner actually believes, and thereby knows, that God hath laid his ſins on Chriſt. *In the ſecret application of this grace unto a perſon, this perſon hath a full diſcharge; and in the manifeſtation he hath the comfort of this diſcharge.* So that every elect Sinner is juſtified from Eternity, as Chriſt died and bore his ſins from Eternity, *viz.* in the Counſel and Decree of God: His ſins are actually paid for, and removed from his Surety too, from the time of Chriſt's ſuffering upon the Croſs. *From that time there was not one ſin to be reckoned, either to Believers who are* P. 265.

Chriſt's

p.259. *Christ's Members, or to Christ himself, he having them made satisfaction, and upon it given out unto the world it is finished*: And this discharge is actually, though secretly, applied to them, as soon as they have any being, and they know that they are discharged as soon as they believe: This is the *Antinomian* account of Justification; and supposing their first Principle, that Christ did represent the persons of the Elect, and do all in their name and stead, I cannot see how it is possible to confute it. I confess, I cannot answer Dr. *Crisp's*

p.272. reasoning; *That God hath not one sin to charge upon any Elect person from the first moment of conception, till the last minute of his life*: because *the Lord hath laid it on Christ already. He did lay sins on him; When did he lay them? When he did pay the full price for them. Now suppose this person uncalled commits Iniquity, and that this Iniquity is charged upon him; seeing that his iniquities are laid upon Christ already, how comes it to pass that they are charged upon this Elect Person again? How come they to be translated again from Christ, and laid upon this Person? Once they were laid upon Christ, it must be confessed, for the bloud of Christ cleanseth us from all sin. Was there by one act of Christ, the expiation of sin, and all at once, that are committed from the beginning of the*

world

*world to the end thereof; how comes it to paſs that this and that ſin ſhould be charged upon the elect perſons, when they were laid upon Chriſt long before?* And, I profeſs, I cannot ſee one hairs breadth difference between Dr. *Owen* and Dr. *Criſp* in this matter, unleſs it be, that Dr. *Criſp* ſpeaks his mind plainly and honeſtly, and Dr. *Owen* endeavours (if it be not a natural infirmity) to cloud his ſenſe with a multitude of words, and to loſe himſelf and his Readers in a labyrinth of diſtinctions, as to give ſome plain evidences of it.

Dr. *Owen*, in his Book entituled, *Salus electorum ſanguis Ieſu*, or, *The death of death in the death of Chriſt*, p. 145. Printed 1648. lays down theſe Propoſitions. Firſt, *That the full and due debt of all thoſe for whom Chriſt was reſponſible, was fully paid in to God according to the utmoſt extent of the Obligation.* Secondly, *That the Lord, who is a juſt Creditor, ought in all equity to cancel the Bond, to ſurceaſe all Suits, Actions, and Moleſtations againſt the Debter, full payment being made to him for the Debt*: And ſince he ought to do this, we need not doubt but he, being a juſt Creditor, does do it. Thirdly, *That the Debt thus paid was not this, or that ſin, but all the ſins of all thoſe for whom, and in whoſe name this payment was made.* Fourthly,

*That*

*That a ſecond payment of a debt, once paid, or a requiring it, is not anſwerable to the juſtice which God demonſtrated in ſetting forth Chriſt to be a propitiation for our ſins*; and therefore it is not juſt with God to require the payment of that Debt again of us, which Chriſt hath already paid for us. And fifthly, *That, whereas to receive a diſcharge from further trouble, is equitably due to the Creditor, who hath been in Obligation, his Debt being paid; the Lord having accepted of the payment from Chriſt, in the ſtead of all them for whom he died, ought in juſtice, according to that Obligation, which in free grace he hath put upon himſelf, give them a diſcharge.* And Sixthly, *conſidering that relaxation of the Law, which by the Supreme Power was effected, as to the perſons ſuffering the puniſhment required, ſuch actual ſatisfaction is made thereto, that it can lay no more to their charge for whom Chriſt died, than if they had really fulfilled in the way of obedience, whatever it did require.* Now I can by no means underſtand what all theſe Propoſitions can ſignifie elſe, but to prove, that thoſe for whom Chriſt died, are diſcharged upon his payment of their Debt, and ſo are juſtified from Eternity, as Chriſt paid their Debt from Eternity, in the Decree of God, and are juſtified in time, as ſoon

as

as they are capable of it, that is, as ſoon they are in being.

In his Book of *Communion*, p. 204. he has ten Propoſitions, much to the ſame purpoſe; He there tells us, *That Chriſt in his undertaking of the work of our Redemption with God, was conſtituted and conſidered, as a common publick perſon in the ſtead of them, for whoſe reconciliation to God he ſuffered.* And *that being thus a common Perſon, upon his undertaking as to merit and efficacy, and upon his actual performance, as to ſolemn declaration,* (this is what Dr. *Criſp* calls *Gods laying iniquity upon Chriſt by way of Obligation, and by way of Execution*) *was as ſuch* (as a common perſon) *acquitted, abſolved, juſtified, and freed from all and every thing, that on the behalf of the Elect, as due to them, was charged upon him, or could ſo be*: So that he was from all Eternity upon his undertaking, and in time upon his actual performance, as a common Perſon, that is, in the name, and as repreſenting the perſons of the Elect, acquitted, abſolved, and juſtified; and therefore as it follows, *Chriſt received the general acquittance for them all, and they are all acquitted in the Covenant of the Mediator, whence they are ſaid to be crucified with him, to die with him, to riſe with him, to ſit with him in heavenly places, namely, in the Covenant*

*of*

*of the Mediatur*. This is what Dr. *Criſp* calls a ſecret application of Gods laying iniquity upon Chriſt to particular perſons, which is done before they know it; and the only difference between him and Dr. *Owen* is, that Dr. *Owen* will not allow this to be a diſcharge of the Elect in their own perſons, but only in the Perſon of the Mediator; and Dr. *Criſp* thinks it more proper to ſay, that this is a perſonal diſcharge of them, ſince it is done in their names and perſons, but it is no great matter who ſpeaks moſt properly, when the thing is the ſame.

In another Diſcourſe *of the Death of Chriſt*, in anſwer to Mr. *Baxter's* Objections againſt his Treatiſe of Redemption, *p.* 72. he aſſerts, that the Elect have an actual right to all that was purchaſed by Chriſt's Death *before believing*, and that is equivalent to their having a right from Eternity, or from the firſt moment of their being. And he offers it as his one opinion, *Whether abſolution from the guilt of ſin, and obligation unto death, though not as terminated in the conſcience* (that is, though it be not known to the Perſon, which is Dr. *Criſp's ſecret application*) *for complete Juſtification, do not precede our actual believing*, and expounds the Juſtification of the ungod-

ungodly, *Rom.* 4. to this ſenſe, as Dr. *Criſp* expreſly does. And though he dare not aſſert *complete Juſtification to be before believing*, yet he affirms, that *abſolution is*, as it is conſidered, *as the act of the Will of God, that is ſecret, and known only to God; for a diſcharge from the effects of anger naturally precedes all collation of any fruits of love, ſuch as faith is.* And the difference between this abſolution and complete Juſtification is no more but this: That abſolution *wants that act of pardoning mercy, which is to be terminated and completed in the conſcience of a ſinner.* That is, though ſuch a man be pardoned before believing, yet he can have no ſenſe of his Pardon before believing, which is exactly Dr. *Criſp's* notion: And abſolution *wants the hearts perſwaſion of the truth and goodneſs of the Promiſe, and the mercy held out in the Promiſe. And it wants the Souls rolling it ſelf on Chriſt, and receiving Chriſt, as the Author and Finiſher of that mercy, an All-ſufficient Saviour to them that believe.* All which ſignifies no more, than that Abſolution is before and without Faith; for this apprehending the truth and goodneſs of the Promiſe, and rolling it ſelf on Chriſt according to the Doctors notion, conſtitute the juſtifying Act of Faith.

And

Commu-nion. p. 205.

And therefore when the Doctor elſe-where tells us, that the Elect, *till the full time of their actual deliverance, determined and appointed to them in their ſeveral Generations, be accompliſhed, are perſonally under the Curſe of the Law, and on that account are legally obnoxious to the wrath of God.* He only chuſes to contradict himſelf, to avoid the imputation of *Antinomianiſm*: For by their *actual deliverance*, I preſume he muſt underſtand the time of their actual believing; and if they are abſolved before they actually believe, how can they be under the Law, or legally obnoxious to the wrath of God? And therefore he immediately qualifies this, that *though they are obnoxious to the Law and the Curſe thereof, yet not at all with its primitive intention of execution upon them*; which is as much as to ſay, that they are obnoxious to the Curſe of the Law, but not obnoxious to the execution of that Curſe, which I take to be non-ſenſe. How then are they obnoxious to the Curſe of the Law? Why, *as it is a means appointed to help forward their acquaintance with Chriſt, and acceptance with God on his account*: By which I ſuppoſe he means, that their Abſolution being at preſent ſecret, and not *terminated and completed in the Conſcience*, they are terrified

and

and ſcared with the threatnings of the Law, as fancying themſelves to be under it, when they are not, and this makes them fly to Chriſt for refuge and ſanctuary. And though Dr. *Criſp* indeed do not like this way of affrighting men to Chriſt by the Law, yet the difference is not great, and makes no material alteration in the Scheme of their Religion.

And therefore when Dr. *Owen* adds, That *it was determined by Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, that the way of the actual perſonal deliverance of the Elect from the Sentence and Curſe of the Law, ſhould be in and by ſuch a way and diſpenſation, as might lead to the praiſe of the glorious grace of God, and to glorifie the whole Trinity, by aſcending to the Fathers love through the works of the Spirit and Bloud of the Son.* All that he means by it is this, that we ſhall have no ſenſe of our Abſolution by the Bloud of Chriſt till we actually believe, nor be actually poſſeſſed of Eternal Life, till we be renewed and ſanctified, all which Dr. *Criſp* will own, and is conſiſtent enough with our Juſtification, or Abſolution from Eternity, ſince Faith and all other bleſſings are the effect of our antecedent Abſolution in Chriſt, as the Doctor confeſſes. And this is all Mr. *Ferguſon* means, when he *Ibid.*

Intereſt of Reaſon, &c. P. 549.

tells us, *That Chriſt's own diſcharge was an immediate conſequent of his ſufferings, and they for whom he ſuffered had alſo immediately a fundamental right of being acquitted, but their actual deliverance was to be in the way and order, that he, who had ſubſtituted himſelf in our room, and he, who had both admitted and been the Author of the ſubſtitution thought fit to appoint.* This is the neceſſary conſequence of this Doctrine, that if Chriſt acted as a Surety in the name and ſtead of particular perſons, then thoſe for whom he acted are abſolved and juſtified by the undertaking or actual performance of Chriſt, either from Eternity, or from the firſt moment of their being.

I might add ſeveral other Conſequences, which neceſſarily reſult from this Doctrine, and are the peculiar Principles of *Antinomianiſm*, as that we muſt not pray for the forgiveneſs of ſins, becauſe they are long ſince removed by the death of Chriſt, but only for the ſenſe of this forgiveneſs; that God ſees no ſin in his people, becauſe their ſins are laid on Chriſt, and that therefore we muſt not lay ſin upon our own Conſciences neither, unleſs we will make our Conſcience a Chriſt: But this is enough to ſhew how fruitful this Principle is of abſurdities,

abſurdities, and what reaſon I have to reject our Union to the Perſon of Chriſt, conſidered as one, who hath done all for us, in our name and ſtead.

And now I need not inſiſt long on the ſecond thing propoſed, *viz. our immediate Union to the Perſon of Chriſt*: For though all Chriſtians are in ſome ſenſe immediately united to Chriſt, as I have ſhewn above, yet in the *Antinomian* ſenſe of an immediate Union, I do utterly reject it, whereby they underſtand an Union to the Perſon of Chriſt, without any intervening Conditions on our part. And this they muſt neceſſarily do according to their notion of the Perſon of Chriſt. They explain this, as I obſerved in my former Diſcourſe, by a Conjugal Relation, and a Legal Union. Knowledge of Chriſt, Chap. 4. Sect. 3.

As for a Conjugal Relation, which conſiſts in ſuch a Union of Perſons, as is between a Man and his Wife, which intitles us to all the perſonal excellencies and perfections, Beauty, Comelineſs, Riches, and Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, as Marriage intitles a Woman to her Husbands Eſtate; and ſecures us from the Wrath of God, and the Accuſations of the Law, as a woman under Covert is not liable to any Action or Arreſt. I per-

ceive Mr. *Ferguſon* gives it over as indefenſible; for among all the ſorts of Unions, which he reckons up, he takes no notice of this, which is the moſt charming and inviting Union, and moſt acceptable to the Siſterhood, the beſt Friends to Conventicles of any other: But I ſuppoſe Mr. *Vincent* will not give it over ſo, and therefore I obſerve, that this muſt be an immediate Union, which requires nothing elſe but an embracing and claſping Faith, which unites their perſons to each other: This Faith is no condition of Union, but only ſuch a conſent to have Chriſt, as is neceſſary to make the Match or rather like joyning hands, which is the Ceremony of Marriage: Though indeed the Marriage was made before, as they ſay all Marriages are, in Heaven. Eternal Election marries them to Chriſt, and this conſenting Faith gives them only a comfortable ſenſe of their Matrimonial Union, as will appear by conſidering the nature of Legal Union, whereby we are united to Chriſt, as to our Surety and Mediator, who does all for us in our name and ſtead.

Now it is a plain demonſtration, that this Union to Chriſt, as to our Surety and Mediator, is immediate, for it is entirely

entirely Gods act in electing ſome particular perſons, and giving them to Chriſt, to do all for them in their name and ſtead. And therefore Dr. *Criſp* truly argues, that it is God, and only God, that can lay our ſins upon Chriſt, that our Repentance, and Faith, and new Obedience cannot do it: For this work of laying ſin on Chriſt, in making him our Surety to do all for us, was done long ſince, and is not to be done now. Chriſt hath already died for all, that he will die for; and if he did not die for us, nothing that we can do now can lay our ſins upon him; For as the Doctor reaſons, if we could afreſh by our Repentance and Faith lay our ſins on Chriſt, as our Surety, how ſhould he get rid of them again? For there is no getting rid of ſin, but by dying for it, and Chriſt hath already done that, and is not to die again.

Chriſt alone exalted. Vol. 2. p. 186, &c

If Chriſt's Suretiſhip conſiſts in his dying and performing all righteouſneſs for particular perſons, elected and choſen by God, our Union to Chriſt as to our Surety muſt be from Eternity, or at leaſt from the time of his appearing in the world; for if he did not act as our Surety then, he cannot do ſo ſince, unleſs we ſhould ſuppoſe, that he muſt come into the

world again, to act over the ſame part in the name and ſtead of thoſe who were left out of the firſt Roll of Election, and therefore I do not wonder, that theſe men are ſo much blundered, and talk backward and forward in thoſe directions, they give to their hearers, how to get into Chriſt; for the truth is, if we are not in Chriſt already, there is no getting into Chriſt now, according to their Principles. Election alone, and Gods giving us to Chriſt unites us to him, not any act of our own, neither Faith, Repentance, or new Obedience; theſe at beſt can only give us a comfortable ſenſe of our Union to Chriſt, but can contribute nothing at all to our Union it ſelf.

Of the death of Chriſt. P. 77.

And therefore Dr. *Owen* does roundly acknowledge, *that Chriſt is reckoned to us in order of nature before we believe*; and by Gods reckoning Chriſt to us, he means, *the imputing of Chriſt unto ungodly unbelieving ſinners, for whom he died, ſo far as to account him theirs, to beſtow Faith and Grace upon them for his ſake.* And if God reckon Chriſt to men before Faith, he muſt reckon him theirs from the time of his giving them to Chriſt, for there can be no other reaſon of his reckoning Chriſt to them at all. And to ſhew how free and abſolute this

gift

gift of Christ is; he tells us, That there is *no condition at all in this stipulation. That God should engage upon the death of Christ to make out Grace and Glory, Liberty and Beauty, unto those for whom he died, upon condition they do so, or so, leaves no proper place for the merit of Christ, and is very improperly ascribed unto God.* And therefore though the Covenant of Grace seem to run conditionally, that if we repent and believe, we shall be saved; yet the Covenant is indeed absolute, because these very conditions are part of Christ's Purchase, and are promised without any condition; and though God will bring us to Heaven in such a way and method, as he has thought fit to prescribe to himself for the *Glory of the Trinity, yet all this, in all the parts of it, is no less fully procured for us, nor less freely bestowed on us, for Christ's sake, and on his account, as part of his Purchase and Merits, than if all of us immediately upon his death, had been translated into heaven.* Ibid. p. 65. Communion p. 206.

From all this it appears, what they mean by *an immediate Union to the Person of Christ*, such an Union to Christ as our Mediator and Surety, as is founded only on Electing Grace, without any thing required on our part, and in this sense, though I deny not particular Election, yet

I diſown our immediate Union to the Perſon of Chriſt.

Chriſt is the Surety and Mediator of the Covenant, who having with his own bloud made a general Atonement and Propitiation for the ſins of the whole world, purchaſed and ſealed the Covenant of Grace, wherein he promiſes pardon of ſin, and Eternal Life to all thoſe who repent and believe the Goſpel. Such a faith in Chriſt, as makes us members of his Body, which is his Church, alone entitles us to all the benefits of his Death and Paſſion; and therefore he is ſaid to redeem his Church with his own bloud; for though his Sacrifice was general and univerſal, yet none have an actual intereſt in it, but his Church, and the particular Members of it. This unites us to Chriſt, and applies his Univerſal grace and mercy particularly to our ſelves. But to imagine, that Chriſt was appointed by God to be a Surety only for particular Perſons, and to act in their name and ſtead, neceſſarily precipitates men into the very dregs of *Antinomianiſm*, which in this looſe, phantaſtical, and degenerate Age is the only popular and taking frenzy.

It is time now to proceed to the vindication of my third and fourth Propoſitions in my Chapter of Union, from the miſrepreſentations of Mr. *Ferguſon*, for this is all the skill he has ſhewn here, to pervert my ſenſe, and to affix ſuch Doctrines to me, as I never dreamt of. The third Propoſition is this, *That the Union between Chriſt and Chriſtians is not a Natural, but Political Union; that is ſuch an Union as there is between a Prince and his Subjects.* The fourth is this, *That Fellowſhip and Communion with God, according to the Scripture notion, ſignifies what we call a Political Union; that is, that to be in Fellowſhip with God and Chriſt ſignifies to be of that Society, which puts us into a peculiar relation to God, that God is our Father, and we his Children, that Chriſt is our Head and Husband, our Lord and Maſter, we his Diſciples and Followers, his Spouſe and his Body.* Theſe two Propoſitions our Author tells us, *are according to the beſt underſtanding of enunciations he has, coincident and equipollent*; which is a plain demonſtration, how little his underſtanding is in theſe matters, when the third Propoſition concerns the nature of our Union, and the fourth the explication of a Scripture term, which had been perverted to a very different, if not contrary ſenſe.

Know-ledge of Chriſt. Chap. 4. Sect. 1.

Intereſt of Reaſon, &c. p. 623.

But

But to let paſs this, and a great many other things of this nature, (as any man muſt do, who would not undertake ſuch a trifling task, as to prove, that our Author neither underſtands Logick nor Philoſophy, nor any other part of good learning, of which there are abundant evidences in this very Treatiſe, where he makes a great ſhew and flouriſh with that little undigeſted knowledge he has) his great Artifice in what follows is to conceal and miſrepreſent my notion of *Political Union*, and then to ſcuffle learnedly and valiantly with his own ſhadow and dreams. Sometimes he repreſents this Political Union to be only ſuch an External Relation as is between a Prince and his Subjects, and ever denies, that I own any influences of Grace from Chriſt, as an *influential head*, as he is pleaſed to call him. And therefore all his reaſonings, proceeding upon ſuch an ignorant or wilful miſtake, all I have to do, is to clear my own notion, and to give an account of the reaſon, why I ſtated it in this manner. As for the firſt: By a Political Union I underſtand ſuch a Union between Chriſt and Chriſtians, as there is between a Prince and his Subjects, which conſiſts in our belief of his Revelations, obedience

to

to his Laws, and ſubjection to his Authority; and that this is the true notion of it, I gave ſufficient evidence in my former Diſcourſe, to which I muſt refer my Reader. But then I obſerved, that this Political Union, between Chriſt and his Church, may be either only *external* and *viſible*, and ſo hypocritical Profeſſors may be ſaid to be united to Chriſt by the Ligaments of an external Profeſſion; or *true* and *real*, which imports the truth and ſincerity of our obedience to our Lord and Maſter, that we really are what we profeſs to be: And herein conſiſts a material difference between that External Union which is between a temporal Prince and his Subjects, and the Union between Chriſt, who is a ſpiritual Head and King, and the true Church, or true and ſincere Chriſtians, who are ſpiritual Subjects. For, as the Authority of Earthly Princes can reach only the External man, becauſe they cannot know our thoughts any other ways than as they are expreſſed in our outward actions, ſo the Union conſiſts in an external Government, and an external Subjection: But Chriſt, being a ſpiritual Prince, governs hearts and thoughts too, and therefore our ſubjection to Chriſt, and conſequently our Union to him, muſt not

be

be only external and visible, but internal and spiritual, which consists in the subjection of our hearts and minds, of our thoughts and passions to his Government. And this real and spiritual Union I explained in four particulars.

First, as I have already observed, it consists in the subjection of our minds and spirits to Christ, as our spiritual King. And secondly, this is represented in Scripture, by a participation of the same nature, which is the necessary effect of the subjection of our minds to him: Upon which account I observed, that our Union to Christ is described *by having the Spirit of Christ*, Rom. 8 9. *If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his*: Which as it respects the cause, whereby we are transformed into a Divine Nature, so it signifies the Holy Spirits dwelling in us; as it signifies the effect, or that *Divine Nature, New Creature,* (which Mr. *Ferguson* himself acknowledges to be the *very bond of our cohesion to Christ*) so it is *that same temper and disposition of mind, which Christ had*; which, as I expressly observed, *is called, having the Spirit of Christ by an ordinary figure of the cause for the effect, for all those vertues and graces, wherein our conformity to Christ consists, are called the fruits of the Spirit,*

Interest of Reason &c. p. 441.

*Spirit.* And in the Page before, *that it is called being born of the Spirit, becauſe all Chriſtian Graces and Vertues are in Scripture attributed to the Spirit of God as the Author of them.* And now I dare truſt any man of common ingenuity to judge, whether I make our Union to Chriſt a meer external thing, or leave out the conſideration of the Spirit of God in our Union to Chriſt, when I aſſert, that that new nature, all thoſe Chriſtian graces, wherein our conformity and internal Union to Chriſt conſiſts, are owing to the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. And whereas Mr. *Ferguſon* is ſo critical, that it will not ſatisfie him, *that the Spirit is preſent in the hearts of Believers in reſpect of that New Creature, Divine Nature, and ſpiritual being, which he hath wrought in them, but immediately alſo*; I would fain learn of him, what he means by this immediate preſence of the Spirit; for if the Holy Spirit be a divine and infinite being, which is preſent every where, how can he be more immediately preſent in one place, or in one perſon, than in another, but only by a more peculiar manifeſtation of himſelf in his effects and operations? As God, who fills all places with his preſence, is ſaid to dwell in Heaven, becauſe there he manifeſts his glory in a more peculiar manner. But

*Ibid.* p. 646.

*Ibid.* p. 645. But I cannot without ſome indignation obſerve, how our Author has prophaned this holy Union between Chriſt and Believers by comparing it with the impure mixtures of a man with a Harlot, and repreſenting the Apoſtle to argue at this rate. The Apoſtle tells us, *That he who is joyned to the Lord is one ſpirit*, 1 Cor. 6. 17. Which I thus explained, *That herein conſiſts our Union to Chriſt, that we have the ſame temper of mind which he had*, (wrought in us by the ſame Holy Spirit, which animates both the Head and the Body, and every member of it, as I acknowledged before) *for there can be no Union between Souls and Spirits without this, that they are acted by the ſame principles, and love and chuſe the ſame things*, &c. Mr. *Ferguſon* diſproves this from that oppoſition, which the Apoſtle (as he ſays) makes between the Union of a man to a Harlot, and our Union to Chriſt; *Know ye not, that he which is joyned to a Harlot is one body, but he that is joyned to the Lord is one ſpirit.* From whence he argues, *If the Union betwixt a man and a Harlot, in the virtue of which they are one body, import more than meerly a likeneſs of temper and moral diſpoſition, as ſurely it doth, foraſmuch as there may be a ſimilitude in ſenſual propenſions and inclinations, where*

*where the becoming one flesh through carnal conjunction interposeth not; much more doth a Believer's, being one spirit with the Lord, imply a higher kind of Union than an affinity of dispositions.* What fine work might a prophane Wit make of this! And indeed I would not have defiled my Paper with it, but only to have vindicated our Apostle, and Christianity together from such sordid and impure abuses: And any one, who consults the place, will easily perceive, that this prophane comparison is owing wholly to our Author, and that the Apostle has nothing to do with it. For in the fifteenth verse he disswades them from Fornication by this Argument, *Know ye not, that your bodies are the members of Christ, shall I take then the members of Christ, and make them members of an Harlot, God forbid.* The undecency of this is very evident, that the members of Christ should be made the members of an Harlot, and therefore the Apostle distinctly proves these two Propositions, that our bodies, as we are Christians, are the members of Christ; and that that body which is joyned to the Harlot, becomes one flesh and body with her. This last he proves from the primitive institution of Marriage, *Two, saith he, shall be one flesh*; For an Harlot is an *uxor usuraria*,

*uſuraria*, who unlawfully ſupplies the place of Wife; and he proves the latter, that our bodies alſo are the members of Chriſt, from that intimate Union of Souls and Spirits betwixt Chriſt and Believers; *He that is joyned to the Lord is one Spirit*, and therefore his body too is a member of Chriſt, for that intimate Union between the body and the ſoul will not admit a ſeparation; Chriſt firſt takes poſſeſſion of our ſouls, and then challenges an intereſt and propriety in our bodies, which muſt be preſerved holy and pure, as the Temples of God.

But then thirdly I obſerved, That *there is a cloſer Union ſtill, which reſults from this, which conſiſts in a mutual and reciprocal love; when we are transformed into the Image of Chriſt, he loves us, as being like to him, and we love him too, as partaking of his nature; He loves us, as the price of his bloud, as his own workmanſhip created unto good works, and we love him, as our Redeemer and Saviour*; for which I produced *Joh.*14.20. *At that day ye ſhall know, that I am in my Father, and you in me, and I in you*: Where by *day* Mr. *Ferguſon* very wiſely underſtands the *glorified ſtate*, this Union being ſuch a Myſtery, as cannot be underſtood in this world, whereas the Circumſtances of the

*Ibid.* p.655.

place

place determine it to our Saviours Reſurrection, and the deſcent of the Holy Spirit, and he himſelf explains the meaning of this Union, Verſ. 21. *He that hath my Commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me, and he that loveth me, ſhall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and manifeſt my ſelf to him.* To the ſame purpoſe Chriſt prays for his Diſciples, *Joh.* 17. 21. *That they may be one, as thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they alſo may be one in us.* Theſe Scriptures are alleadged by Mr. *Ferguſon* too, but to prove he knows not what: He acknowledges, *That it is not an oneneſs of Eſſence betwixt Chriſt and Believers, that is here to be underſtood; nor yet is it meerly an oneneſs of will and affection between the Father and the Son, but it is an Eſſential Unity here meant.* Well, Is there an Eſſential Unity then here meant betwixt Chriſt and Believers? No, that he rejected before; What then? Why, *though we plead not for the ſame kind of oneneſs between Chriſt and Believers, as is between the Father and the Son, yet we affirm that ſomething more ſublime than barely a Political Relation is adumbrated and ſhadowed forth to us.* Something more than External-Political Union I believe is intended by them; but what ſublime thing *Ibid.* p. 628.

is that, which is *adumbrated and ſhadowed forth to us* in theſe words (which expreſſions argue, that our Author is not very clear in it) that he tells us, that *by alluding to that incomprehenſible Idendity, which is between the perſons of the bleſſed Trinity through a numericalneſs of nature, he would inſtruct us, that the Union between Chriſt, and thoſe that are born of God, is intimate, great, and Myſterious, as well as true and real.* But Mr. *Ferguſon* elſe-where tells us, that all Unions are *Myſterious*, and there are ſeveral ſorts of *intimate, and great, and true, and real Unions*; ſo that we are never the wiſer for this account of our Union to Chriſt. But our Saviours plain and obvious meaning is this, that as there is a perfect harmony of will, and affections, and deſign, and a perfect agreement in Doctrine between the Father and himſelf, founded on the unity of nature; ſo he prays that his Diſciples may be one alſo among themſelves, and with God from their agreement in the ſame belief, and participation of the ſame nature, and a unity and harmony of Affections.

But then I obſerved fourthly, that this Union is expreſſed in Scripture by reſembling the Chriſtian Church to Gods Temple, wherein he dwells, as formerly he did

did in the Temple at *Jeruſalem*. That God now dwells in the Chriſtian Church by his Holy Spirit, as he formerly did in the Jewiſh Temple by Types and Figures, and that he does not dwell thus in the Chriſtian Church only, as a ſpiritual Society, but in every particular Chriſtian, as I explained at large in my former Diſcourſe; which is a plain demonſtration of our Authors honeſty in charging me with rejecting the Inhabitation of the Holy Spirit, and making a meer External-Political Union between Chriſt and Chriſtians.

This is ſufficient to vindicate my own notion from the falſe repreſentations of this Author, and I might honourably enough retreat, and leave him to skirmiſh with his own ſhadow, but to do all the right that may be to my cauſe, and to ſatisfie all unprejudiced & teachable minds, I ſhall give ſome farther account of the reaſon, why I ſtated the notion of our Union to Chriſt in this manner.

And firſt, the true reaſon, why I did not more particularly diſcourſe of the influences of the Divine Spirit, but was contented to give ſome plain and ſhort intimations of it, was, becauſe I principally deſigned to conſider, what was neceſſary

on our part, as matter of duty, in order to our Union with Chriſt: For here are the great and dangerous miſtakes; here it is, that my Adverſaries have confounded the plain Notions of Religion, and lead men into intricate Labyrinths and Meanders. What is neceſſary on Chriſt's part, he will be ſure to effect, whether we do ſo clearly and perfectly underſtand it or not; but unleſs we underſtand, what is neceſſary on our part, it is impoſſible we ſhould do it, unleſs it be by perfect chance and accident: Theſe new Divines cannot to this day direct men how to get into Chriſt, or to be united to him. They talk of a Legal and a Myſtical Union, but what we muſt do to be thus Legally and Myſtically united to Chriſt they know not; we muſt expect till God gives Chriſt to us, or till Chriſt unite us to himſelf, or rather till he give us a ſenſe and knowledge that we are united. And this is a very hard caſe, that when our Eternal happineſs depends on our Union to Chriſt, we ſhould be ſo perfectly ignorant how to attain to this Union.

Nay, they had ſo ordered the matter, that a very good man, who heartily believes the Goſpel of Chriſt, and makes conſcience of obeying it, if he be ſo

weak

weak as to hearken to their preachments, may be perplext with Eternal Scruples about his Union to Chriſt; while a bad man, who hath a warm and Enthuſiaſtick fancy, and can work his imagination into all the various Scenes of the New Birth, ſhall live in the perpetual embraces of Chriſt, and in the Raptures and Extaſies of aſſurance, and deſpiſe the low attainments of morality and a good life.

Now my principal deſign was to rectifie theſe dangerous miſtakes, to give men ſuch a notion of our Union to Chriſt, that they may certainly know by what means they may attain this Union; and that good men may reap the comfort of it, and bad men, though never ſuch Seraphical hypocrites, may ſee all their hopes confuted, and be forced either to let go all their pretences of Union to Chriſt, or enter upon a new courſe of life: And I could not better do this, than by making it appear, that to be united to Chriſt ſignifies to be his Diſciples, to be incorporated into his Church by a publick profeſſion of Faith and obedience, and to conform our hearts and lives to the Laws of the Goſpel: And therefore I choſe all along to expound thoſe expreſſions of

being *one Spirit with Christ*, of *having the Spirit of Christ*, of *Christ's dwelling in us*, and the like, so as to explain what they signified on our part, *viz.* to be transformed into the Image of Christ, to be animated by the same love of vertue and goodness, to have the same Spirit, the same temper of mind which he had, than to dispute concerning the manner of the Divine Spirits inhabitation, and operation in us, which possibly will never be determined (as very few modes of things are) and is not much material whether it be or not, so long as we heartily believe, and importunately beg, and constantly rely on the assistances of the Divine Grace.

Secondly, There is a further account to be given of this, because the gift of the Spirit is consequent to our Union to Christ, but does not constitute the formal nature of it. That there are some antecedaneous operations of the Holy Spirit, whereby we are disposed to believe the Gospel, and to list our selves into the number of Christ's Disciples, I do not deny; but these are of a very different consideration from that gift of the Holy Spirit which is bestowed on those who are actually incorporated into the Chri-

stian

ſtian Church, and made the Members of Chriſt: For Chriſt has promiſed his Holy Spirit only to thoſe who are actually united to him, and indeed in order of nature a member muſt firſt be united to the body, before it can receive any influences from the Head. The gift of the Holy Spirit is an act of Chriſts Kingly Power and Authority, and concerns only his Church, and the members of it: Juſt as Temporal Princes can exerciſe no juriſdiction but over their own Subjects, and therefore we muſt firſt be united to Chriſt, as members of his Church, before we can expect to partake of the benefits and advantages (of which the gift of the Holy Spirit is none of the leaſt) of his Government.

God vouchſafes the aſſiſtances of the Holy Spirit to all men, to whom the Goſpel is preached, to work Faith in them, but when men do actually believe, and give themſelves up to Chriſt in ſuch regular ways, as he has appointed, then the Holy Spirit is a conſtant Principle in them upon Covenant and Promiſe; upon which account he is ſaid to dwell in them, and to make his abode with them, becauſe he is always preſent as a Principle of a divine life; and therefore according to

the ſenſe of Scripture, of the ancient Church, and of the Church of *England*, the Baptiſm of the Spirit is annexed to our Baptiſm with water, which is the Ceremony of our Initiation into the Chriſtian Church, which upon that account in the ancient Church was called φωτισμὸς, or illumination, becauſe the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of wiſdom and knowledge was then beſtowed on them.

And indeed Dr. *Owen* and all my Adverſaries, though they differ from me in their Notion of our Union to Chriſt, yet do, and according to their Principles muſt acknowledge, that we are firſt united to Chriſt, before the Holy Spirit is beſtowed on us. And Dr. *Owen* proves, that Chriſt is firſt reckoned unto us before we believe, (and I can underſtand no difference between Chriſts being reckoned to us, and our being united to him, that is, our being reckoned to him) becauſe the Holy Spirit, which works faith in us, is beſtowed on us for Chriſt's ſake, and upon account of our Union to him: And then certainly the Holy Spirit does not primarily unite us to Chriſt, but is an effect and conſequent of our Union to him. And this I expreſly aſſerted in my former Diſcourſe, that *this Union to Chriſt entitles us to his peculiar*

Of the Death of Chriſt in anſwer to M. *Baxter* P. 77, &c.

*peculiar care and providence, to the influences of his grace, to the power of his Interceſſion*, &c.

And thirdly, for the ſame reaſon I did not ſo largely and particularly diſcourſe of Chriſt's being an *Influential Head* (though I expreſly own thoſe influences of grace, which we receive from Chriſt) becauſe he is ſo only as he is a Political Head. That is, as Temporal Princes govern their Subjects by external Arts, and Methods of Diſcipline: So Chriſt, who is a Spiritual Prince, governs his Subjects, and dwells in them by his Spirit. The gift of the Spirit is an Act of his Regal Power, is beſtowed only on his Subjects, and is diſpenſed in ſuch regular ways, as he has preſcribed for the external Conduct and Government of his Church. Thus the Spirit is at firſt conferred on us in Baptiſm, and the daily ſupplies of it are adminiſtred upon our conſtant and devout Prayers, as our Saviour has promiſed, that God will give his Spirit to them, who ask him: And we muſt expect the conſtant illuminations of the Spirit, and the ſupplies of Grace in the adminiſtration of the Word and Sacrament of the Lords Supper: By theſe means Chriſt, as our Prince and Saviour conveighs his Grace to us, which requires our Communion with

with his Church in all Sacred Inſtitutions, and is the true baſis and ſecurity of Eccleſiaſtical Authority. Thus St. *Paul* tells us, That *Chriſt is the Head from whom the whole body fitly joyned together and compacted, by that which every joynt ſupplieth, according to the effectual working in the meaſure of every part, maketh increaſe of the body to the edifying it ſelf in love*, Eph. 4. 15, 16. *and* Col. 2. 18. *And not holding the Head from which all the body with joynts and bands having nouriſhment miniſtred and knit together, increaſeth with the increaſe of God.* In which places the Apoſtle repreſents the nouriſhment and increaſe of the Chriſtian Church, and of every member in it, by the growth of the natural body; in which every member does not receive its influences and nouriſhment immediately from the Head; but one member communicates to another in ſuch juſt and equal proportions, and regular ways, as may be moſt for the good of the whole body. Thus every Chriſtian, who is a member of the Church and body of Chriſt, does receive the influences of Grace from Chriſt, for his increaſe and nouriſhment, but he does not receive theſe influences immediately, but they are beſtowed on him by the Miniſtry of men in the regular adminiſtration of

thoſe holy Inſtitutions, which our Saviour has appointed for that end; and this is for the publick benefit and advantage of the Chriſtian Church, to ſecure the Authority of Church Governours, and to preſerve the Unity of Chriſtians among themſelves.

This gives a plain account, why I would not call the Perſon of Chriſt the Fountain of Grace, nor ſend Perſons immediately to Chriſt for life, and power, and all ſpiritual ſupplies, becauſe though Chriſt be the great Miniſter of Grace, yet we muſt not derive it immediately from his Perſon, but he diſpenſes his Grace in the Preaching of the Word, or the adminiſtration of Sacraments, and ſuch other regular Methods, as he has appointed for the Government of his Church, and the increaſe and growth of his ſpiritual body.

Whereas Dr. *Owen*, and Dr. *Criſp*, and the reſt of the *Antinomians*, repreſent Chriſt as ſuch a Perſon, who has not only done all for us, but has undertaken to do all in us, and that by ſuch natural conveyances of Grace from his Perſon, as there is of the animal ſpirits from the head to the reſt of the members, and that men muſt firſt be united to Chriſt before they can be capable of any ſpiritual motion. So

Dr. *Criſp*,

Christ alone exalted. Vol. 1. p. 160. &c

Dr. *Criſp*, very agreeably to what Dr. *Owen* aſſerts, tells us, That *Chriſt is the Head; now the Head is the Fountain of all animal Spirits, and of all motion; without a Head, a man cannot hear, ſee, walk, feel, ſtir, nor do any thing, ſeeing all theſe operations come from the Head; Chriſt is the Head of his Church, he is the Fountain of all ſpiritual ſenſe and motion; you may as ſoon conceive that a man is able to ſee, whilſt he hath not a Head, as to think a man may have ſpiritual eyes, whether the eye of Faith to behold Chriſt, or the eyes of mourning to lament his wretchedneſs, before there be actually the conjunction of Chriſt the Head to ſuch a Body. Thus Chriſt is called Life, and can any one be an active Creature before there be life breathed into him? —As a Body without a Soul is dead, ſo every Perſon in ſpiritual Actions is wholly dead, till Chriſt, the Soul of that Soul, be infuſed into him to animate and enliven him.* For theſe men, as I obſerved before, having deſtroyed all the Arguments to a good life, and all the regular and ordinary Methods of Grace, are forced to reſolve the renovation of our minds into a Natural, and Phyſical, and Immediate operation of Chriſt upon our minds, which makes all his Inſtitutions very inſipid and uſeleſs things, and deſtroys the Authority, and Neceſſity of Chriſtian Societies,

Societies, if all Grace be ſo immediately derived from the Perſon of Chriſt.

Theſe things deſerve a larger diſcourſe, but I am now a haſtening towards a concluſion, and this is ſufficient to vindicate my ſelf, and my notions, from that unjuſt and ſcandalous Imputation of *Pelagianiſm*, which can be attributed only either to the ignorance of my Adverſaries, or to their want of better Arguments, or poſſibly to both.

CHAP.

## CHAP. VI.

*Containing an Anſwer to the charge of Socinianiſm, and the Concluſion of the whole.*

I Am now come to the laſt part of my Task, which may be diſpatched in a few words. Dr. *Owen*, and Mr. *Ferguſon*, and the reſt of my Adverſaries, do at every turn, eſpecially when they have nothing elſe to anſwer, charge me with *Socinianizing*. A charge which was as much unexpected, as undeſerved; but is now grown a very familiar Art among theſe accuſers of the Brethren, to blaſt the Reputation of thoſe men, who make it their deſign to vindicate Chriſtianity from thoſe abſurd, and ſenſleſs, and pernicious Doctrines, which they have broached under the name of Goſpel Myſteries, and to reduce people to the Communion of the Church of *England*, from which they have been ſeduced through the Witchcraft and Enchantments of ſublime and Seraphical non-ſenſe; and if ever it be juſt to expreſs ſome indignation, it is in this caſe, for

for as the Father obſerves, *In cauſa hæreſeos neminem decet eſſe patientem*; It becomes no man to be tame and gentle when he is charged with Hereſie; and therefore I did not think fit wholly to paſs over this charge in ſilence, nor yet ſhall I inſiſt long on it, ſince there is no other foundation for it, but unchriſtian ſpight and malice. I ſuppoſe it will ſignifie no great matter to vindicate my ſelf, nor thoſe who ſuffer with me under the ſame Imputation, by a publick abrenunciation of *Socinianiſm*; for if this would do it, our Subſcription to the Articles of our Church, our conſtant uſe of the *Liturgy*, eſpecially the *Litany*, and *Gloria Patri*, the *Nicene* and *Athanaſian* Creeds, the old and allowed Teſts of Orthodox Chriſtians, which no *Socinian* will allow, and is the true cauſe why they renounce our Communion, would be a ſufficient juſtification both of my ſelf and them; But they who have made ſuch a familiar practice of it to diſpenſe with the moſt Sacred Oaths and Promiſes, are apt to ſuſpect all men to be as faithleſs, as they have proved themſelves: But however becauſe the clamours of theſe men have abuſed ſome innocent perſons, and betrayed them to very unjuſt apprehenſions of my ſelf, and many

many others, I do heartily declare, that I am no *Socinian*, and that I do not know any Divine of the Church of *England*, who can reaſonably be ſuſpected of that Hereſie; though it is notoriouſly evident, that thoſe Sectaries, who are ſo ready to charge us with *Socinianiſm*, have derived the greateſt ſtrength of their cauſe from *Socinian* Writers, eſpecially in the caſe of Anabaptiſm, Liberty of Conſcience, and unlimited Toleration, and rejecting the Authority of Civil Magiſtrates in the External Conduct of Religious Affairs, as they have borrowed their other Principles of Rebellion and depoſing Princes from the worſt of Papiſts.

The reaſon why *Socinus* has ſo ill a Character in the Chriſtian Church, is his denial of the Eternal Godhead and ſatiſfaction of our Saviour; but both theſe I own, and make them the foundation of my Religion: I expreſly call him the *Eternal Son of God, that Eternal Son of God by whom the worlds were made.* I acknowledge *that Chriſt died as a Sacrifice and Expiation for ſin, that by his Death he made Atonement for ſin. That he purchaſed, and procured, and ſealed the Covenant of Grace in his own bloud; That Chriſt by his Death expiated our ſins, and confirmed an Everlaſting Covenant; and being aſcended*

Knowledge of Chriſt. p. 81, 82. Edit. 2. p. 56 *Ibid.* p. 330. 328. Edit. 2. p. 229. &c.

*aſcended up into Heaven, he there apppears in the preſence of God for us, and perpetually intercedes in the vertue of his bloud once offered, which is of infinite more value than the repeated Sacrifices of the Law.* At this rate I diſcourſed not once or twice, but as often as occaſion ſerved; and if this be *Socinianiſm*, I acknowledge my ſelf to be a *Socinian*, and if it be not, let others judge what my Adverſaries are.

But let us conſider, what pretences they have for charging me with *Socinianiſm*. And firſt Dr. *Owen* affirms, that I maintain *the Socinian Notion of Juſtification*: And now I am very well contented to be a Socinian, for I have very good company in it, even the Church of *England* her ſelf, as I have made appear above: For my notion of Juſtification is no other than what the Church of *England* does own and aſſert. But what is this Socinian Notion of Juſtification? *That we are juſtified by believing and obeying the Goſpel of Chriſt.* This indeed the Socinians do aſſert, and ſo do I; and yet there is a vaſt difference between us; becauſe they reject the ſatisfaction of Chriſt, as the meritorious cauſe of our Juſtification, which I own. Vindicat. p. 227.

Upon the ſame account *Ravenſpergerus* (ſuch another zealous Bigot as my Adverſaries),

versaries) charged *Grotius* with *Socinianism*, even when he writ against *Socinus* at a better rate than these men are acquainted with, because he attributed our Justification and pardon of sin to Faith in Christ, and repentance from dead works, as *Socinus* does; and the answer, which *Vossius* gives to him, may serve my Adversaries. *Socinus, at ipse censor agnoscit, nullo alio medio interveniente hanc fidei attribuit securitatem, id est, liberationem à pœna: Grotius vero aliud statuit medium intervenire, nempe perpessiones Christi, habentes rationem pœnæ, propter quas Deus nos à pœnis velit liberare; Grotio igitur prius est medium satisfactionis, quam fidei, at Socino solum medium est fides, non satisfactio.* i. e. Socinus *attributes our security from the wrath of God, or our deliverance from punishment, only to Faith, without any other medium*; i. e. *without the intervention of the Death and Sacrifice of Christ: But* Grotius *asserts another medium of our Pardon and Justification*; viz. *the sufferings of Christ under the notion of punishments, for which God was pleased to deliver us from punishment. And therefore* Grotius *first attributes our Justification to the satisfaction of Christ as the meritorious cause of it, and then to Faith, as the Condition; But* Socinus *acknowledges Faith, but rejects Satisfaction.* And therefore Dr. *Owen*

*Vossii resp. ad Judic. Ravensp. p. 283.*

Dr. *Owen* himſelf, when he formerly charged Mr. *Baxter* with *Socinianiſm* upon the very ſame ſcore, and drew a parallel between that account, which Mr. *Baxter* gave of juſtification, and what is given by *Slitchtingius*, and ſome other Socinians, was ſo modeſt then as to confeſs, that he was a Socinian in this point, as far as any one could be, who acknowledges ſatisfaction; which is as much as to ſay, that he was no Socinian.

Thus to proceed, they almoſt every where charge me with tranſcribing my interpretations of Scripture out of the Socinian Expoſitors, and therefore I muſt be a Socinian. Now ſuppoſe this were true, that I did make uſe of thoſe Expoſitions, which the Socinians give of many places of Scripture, what hurt is there in it if there be no Socinianiſm in them? For I have heard men, who underſtand very well what belongs to expounding Scripture, acknowledge the Socinians to be excellent Expoſitors, where their own peculiar Notions are not concerned, though no men play more tricks with Scripture, where they are: I do very often make uſe of Mr. *Calvin's* Expoſitions, and why do not they hence conclude me to be a *Calviniſt*? And indeed in moſt of

thoſe places, where they charge me with tranſcribing out of the *Socinians*, they might as juſtly have charged me with tranſcribing out of *Calvin*, and, had they known all, with greater reaſon too: For *Calvin* I did conſult upon all occaſions, but the Socinians I never did.

I have already taken notice of and vindicated moſt of thoſe Expoſitions which my Adverſaries charge with Socinianiſm, as I have occaſionally met with them, but Mr. *Ferguſon* has put together ſome Texts, which he thinks I have ſo expounded, as to deſtroy their evidence for the *Godhead* of Chriſt. *I would not* (ſays our Author) *be thought to impeach Mr.* Sherlock *of oppoſing the God-head of Chriſt, but this I affirm, that if his gloſſes of* Col. 1. 19. Col. 2. 3, 8. Joh. 14. 20. Joh. 1. 14. (*which are the very ſame that the Socinians impoſe upon thoſe places*) *be admitted, we have ſome of the main proofs of it, wreſted out of our hands.* I always ſuſpect our Author of ſome ill deſign, when he ſpeaks fairly; he will not impeach me of oppoſing the God-head of Chriſt; but he will ſtrongly inſinuate, that I ſecretly undermine the foundations of that belief, and that I expound thoſe Scriptures, which are produced for the confirmation of it, juſt as the Socinians do,

Intereſt of Reaſon, &c. P. 475.

do, who deny it. I preſume our Author was ſecure, that his Proſelytes would take his word for this, and never concern themſelves to examine the truth of it; for the impoſture is ſo very obvious, that no man can miſs the diſcovery of it, who takes never ſo little pains in the inquiry.

Moſt of theſe places concern that account I gave *of the fulneſs of Chriſt*, and in what ſenſe the *fulneſs of the God-head is ſaid to dwell bodily in him*, Col. 1.19. Joh. 1. 14. Col. 2.8. And the account I gave of it in ſhort was this, that the Evangeliſt and Apoſtles in theſe expreſſions had a peculiar reſpect *to the perfection of the Goſpel-revelation*, that Chriſt had now made a full and perfect revelation of Gods will to the world; and much to the ſame purpoſe, I confeſs, *Slitchtingius*, and other Socinians expound thoſe Texts; but then Mr. *Ferguſon* might have obſerved, that I gave a large account of the reaſon of that phraſe, why the Apoſtle expreſſes the perfection of the Goſpel-revelation by the *fulneſs of the Godhead dwelling bodily in Chriſt*, viz. *That this is an alluſion to Gods dwelling in the Temple at* Jeruſalem *by Types and Figures, which were the Symbols of his preſence. — And this Symbolical preſence of God*

Knowledge of Chriſt. p. 216. &c. Edit. 2. p. 151.

*in the Temple, was very agreeable to that Symbolical and Ceremonial Worſhip, which he then inſtituted and commanded. But now he hath ſent his Son to tabernacle among us,* Joh. 1. 14. *The Deity it ſelf now dwells in the Temple of Chriſts body, not by Types and Figures, as he formerly dwelt in the Temple at* Jeruſalem, *but by a real and immediate preſence and union. And therefore thoſe revelations, which are made by Chriſt, are anſwerable to the inhabitation of the Godhead in him, contain a true and perfect declaration of Gods will in oppoſition to the imperfect rudiments, and obſcure Types and Figures of the Law; ſo that* σωματικῶς, bodily *is oppoſed to Figurative and Typical, and this is a plain demonſtration of the perfection of the Goſpel revelation, that the fulneſs of the Deity dwelt ſubſtantially in Chriſt, and we need not doubt, but that ſo excellent a Prophet as he was, in whom the Deity it ſelf inhabited, hath perfectly revealed Gods will to us.* And now our Author had need rub his forehead hard to maintain this to be the very ſame account which the Socinians give of theſe Texts, or that this does evacuate the teſtimony of theſe Scriptures for the Godhead of our Saviour, when indeed this is the only way to wreſt theſe Scriptures out of the Socinians hands: whoever denies, that the Apoſtle did by that

that expreſſion of *the fulneſs of the Godhead dwelling bodily in Chriſt*, intend to ſignifie the perfection of that revelation, which Chriſt hath made to the world, muſt of neceſſity be baffled by the Socinians, there being ſo many evident proofs of this from the whole deſign of the Apoſtle in that place, that it cannot be avoided; and therefore the only way to vindicate theſe teſtimonies for the Deity of our Saviour, is not to argue from the primary intention and deſign of the Apoſtle in that place, but from the nature and reaſon of the expreſſion; why the Apoſtle ſhould deſcribe the perfection of the Goſpel Revelation, by *the fulneſs of the Godhead dwelling bodily in Chriſt*, which no man can give any tolerable account of, who denies the Deity of Chriſt.

But what will Mr. *Ferguſon* ſay, if Mr. *Calvin* gives the very ſame account of the words, which I do? and yet if he will but conſult him upon the place, he will find, that my gloſs is much more like Mr. *Calvins* than *Slitthtingius's*, or any other Socinian's. His words are theſe, *Cùm dicit plenitudinem Deitatis habitare in Chriſto, nihil aliud ſibi vult, quàm totum Deum in ipſo inveniri, ut aliquid Deo melius ac præſtantius appetat, qui ſolo Chriſto non eſt contentus:* *Calvin. in locum.*

i. e. *when the Apoſtle ſays, that the fulneſs of the Godhead dwelt in Chriſt, he means no more, than that all God is to be found in him, and therefore he muſt deſire ſomething better and more excellent than God, who is not contented with Chriſt alone.* And what he means by this he further explains, *Summa eſt, quòd Deus in Chriſto ſe nobis plenè ac in ſolidum exhibuerit. The ſum is this, that God hath fully and perfectly declared himſelf to us in Chriſt.* Here is the perfection of the Goſpel Revelation, which Mr. *Calvin* ſays is the ſum of what the Apoſtle intended in that expreſſion; and therefore he tells us, that the Apoſtle by *Corporaliter* bodily, *underſtands ſubſtantialiter* ſubſtantially: *For the Apoſtle oppoſes that manifeſtation, which Chriſt hath made of God, to all others, that ever were before; Deus enim ſæpius ſe exhibuit hominibus, ſed in parte, in Chriſto autem totum ſe nobis communicat, aliàs etiam ſe manifeſtavit, ſed in figuris, in Chriſto autem eſſentialiter nobis apparuit. For God did often manifeſt himſelf before, but thoſe were partial and imperfect revelations, but now he hath communicated his whole ſelf to us in Chriſt,* i. e. *the perfect knowledge of his will: He manifeſted himſelf alſo in other ways, but it was in Types and Figures, but now he hath appeared eſſentially to us in Chriſt,* that is, as he is in himſelf.

Thus

Thus on *Joh.* 1.14. *The word was made flesh, and dwelt among us,* (*and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father*) *full of grace and truth.* Mr. *Calvin* has this note, *Simpliciter interpretor, Christum Apostolis indè agnitum fuisse pro filio Dei, quòd complementum omnium, quæ ad spirituale Dei regnum pertinent, in se haberet, denique quòd in omnibus verè & præstiterit redemptorem & Messiam. I expound this* (says he) *in the most plain and simple manner, that hence the Apostles knew Christ to be the Son of God, because in him was found the completion and perfection of whatever appertained to the spiritual Kingdom of God,* a fulness of truth and grace, and *that in all things he acquitted himself as a true Redeemer and Messias.*

On *Joh.*14.20. *At that day shall you know, that I am in my Father, and you in me, and I in you,* Mr. *Calvin* expressly asserts, that our Saviour does not speak *de æternâ suâ essentia simpliciter sed divinam illam virtutem, quæ in eo fuit patefacta, commendat; Simply of his Eternal Essence, but commends that divine power and vertue, which appeared in him;* and accounts this the best answer to the Arrians objection from these words, *That Christ was God participatione tantum & gratiâ, only by participation and by Grace.*

On

On *Joh.* 17.21. *That they all may be one, as thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us.* Mr. *Calvin* obſerves, *Tenendum eſt, quoties unum ſe cum patre eſſe in hoc capite pronunciat Chriſtus, ſermonem non habere ſimpliciter de divinâ ejus eſſentiâ, ſed unum vocari in perſonâ mediatoris, & quatenùs caput noſtrum eſt*; That is, *we muſt acknowledge and own, that as often as Chriſt calls himſelf one with the Father in this Chapter, it does not ſimply and primarily refer to the unity of the Divine Eſſence, but he is one with the Father conſidered as Mediator, and head of the Church*; That is, as he acts in Gods name and authority, and does his will. And he adds, *That many of the Fathers expound theſe words, of Chriſts being one with the Father, as he was Eternal God, but this they were forced to by their contention with the Arrians, longè autem aliud Chriſti conſilium fuit, quàm ad nudam arcanæ ſuæ divinitatis ſpeculationem nos evehere, But Chriſt had a quite different deſign in theſe words, than to raiſe them to a naked contemplation of his ſecret and unſearchable divinity.* And now if Mr. *Ferguſon* will be a juſt and impartial Judge, he muſt accoſt Mr. *Calvin* as he has done me. *I would not be thought to impeach Mr.* Calvin *of oppoſing the Godhead of Chriſt, but this I affirm, that if his gloſſes of* Col. 1. 19. Col. 2. 3. *and* 2. 8. Joh. 14.

Joh. 14.20. Joh.1.14. *and add* Joh.17.21. *(which are as much the same as Mr.* Sherlock's *with those the Socinians impose upon those places) be admitted, we have some of the main proofs of it wrested out of our hands.*

But to proceed, Dr. *Owen* hath given in his charge against me very fully and emphatically: *He that shall consider what reflexions are cast in this discourse, on the necessity of satisfaction to be made unto divine Justice, and from whom they are borrowed, the miserable weak attempt that is made therein, to reduce all Christ's mediatory actings to his Kingly Office, and in particular his Intercession; the faint mention that is made of the satisfaction of Christ, clogged with the addition of ignorance of the Philosophy of it, as it is called, well enough complying with them, who grant that the Lord Christ did what God was satisfied withal, with sundry other things of the like nature, will not be to seek whence these things come, nor whither they are going, nor to whom our Author is beholden for most of his rare notions, which it is an easie thing at any time to acquaint him withal.* Vindicat. p.131.

The Doctors chief skill lies in scandalous insinuations, but he is just like other men, when he comes to reason: As for that *attempt to reduce all Christ's Mediatory actings to his Kingly Office*, I have given a sufficien-

ſufficient account of that in anſwer to Mr. *Ferguſon*, and ſuppoſe I ſhall hear no more of it: As for *my faint mention of the ſatisfaction of Chriſt, clogged with an ignorance of the Philoſophy of it*; what he calls a faint mention I cannot tell, but I did more than once expreſly aſſert it, and that very heartily, but I muſt beg his pardon, that I dare not pretend to underſtand the ſtrict Philoſophy of that Atonement made by Chriſt, ſo long as I aſſert, that every Chriſtian may eaſily learn all that is uſeful and neceſſary for him to know; We may all know, whatever the Scripture has revealed about it, that Chriſt died for our ſins, that he died for us, that he is a propitiation for the ſins of the whole world, that we are reconciled to God by the death of his Son, that his bloud is the bloud of the Covenant, that he has redeemed his Church with his own bloud, and hath purchaſed and ratified the New Teſtament with his bloud; which gives us the greateſt aſſurance of the pardon of our ſins, and the promiſes of eternal life upon the conditions of a lively active faith, which is made perfect by works. But then there are ſome enquiries concerning this matter of a nicer ſpeculation, as wherein the proper nature

of

of atonement and expiation consists, in what sense the death of Christ may be said to satisfie the justice of God, whether Christ died as the Surety of particular Persons, or as the Surety of the Covenant; whether Christ suffered the *Idem* or the *tantundem*; what is the immediate effect of Christs death, whether to give an actual right to those for whom he died to pardon and life, or to seal the Covenant of grace with mankind, and to put all men into a possibility of salvation. I presume the Doctor knows, that these and a great many more such questions are hotly disputed among those very men, who do not use to make a very faint mention neither of the satisfaction of Christ; and methinks the Doctor should for once have commended the *young mans* modesty, that he would not peremptorily determine these matters, rather than blame me for professing my ignorance.

And as for what the Doctor adds, that this savours of a compliance with them, *who grant that the Lord Christ did what God was satisfied withal.* If I mistake not, this is the utmost of what he himself can bring it to, whether right or wrong I shall not now determine; for he expressly affirms, *that Christ could not merit of God, with*

Of the death of Christ, in answer to M. Baxter. p. 52.

*with that kind of merit, which ariſeth from an abſolute proportion of things*, and gives this wiſe reaſon for it, becauſe *Chriſt in reſpect of his humane nature, though united to the Deity, is a Creature, and ſo could not abſolutely ſatisfie, nor merit any thing at the hand of God. This merit (from an abſolute proportion) can be found only among Creatures, and the advancement of Chriſts humanity takes it not out of that number; neither in this ſenſe can any ſatisfaction be made to God for ſin.* And therefore he founds the merit and ſatisfaction of Chriſt upon *Gods conſtitution and determination, predeſtinating Chriſt unto that work, and appointing the work by him to be accompliſhed, to be ſatisfactory, equalling (by that conſtitution) the end and the means.* Which at moſt ſignifies no more but this, that what Chriſt did was not in its own nature ſatisfactory, but was only what God was ſatisfied with upon account of his own conſtitution and determination. And therefore all the merit the Doctor aſcribes to Chriſt *is the accompliſhment of that condition, which God required to make way, that the Obligation, which he had freely put upon himſelf, might be in actual force.* Which he ſays is no more *than what Mr.* Baxter *aſſigns to our own works:* By which we may learn what a lame and conditional

*Ibid.* p. 66.

conditional merit and satisfaction he attributes to Christ: Nay, he is so far from attributing any merit and satisfaction to what Christ did, that he affirms, *that the will of God is not moved thereby, nor changed into any other respect towards those for whom Christ died, than what it had before*, which I take to be *complying* with those who assert, that God was not moved by the death of Christ to forgive sin, and who those are, I presume the Doctor knows, since he has so often told me of them. Ibid. p. 50.

As for what he insinuates, that I deny *the necessity of satisfaction to be made unto divine Justice*, I own the charge, and have as good company in it, as heart can wish: for, not to take notice of our modern Writers, who (whatever the Doctor may think of it) have writ at a better rate against the *Socinians*, than the *necessity men*, *Vossius* gives us a particular account of the concurring judgment of the ancient Fathers in this point. Resp ad Judic. Ravensp. p. 336.

The Author of that Book *de Cardinalibus Christi operibus*, *Athanasius*, St. *Austin*, *Leo M.* *Gregorius M.* together with several eminent Divines of the Reformed Churches, and particularly a great man of our own the Bishop of *Coventry*

*Coventry* and *Lichfield*, who in his Letter to *Grotius*, gives an account of the ſenſe of this Church in this point of the neceſſity of ſatisfaction: *Nos in ſententia Auguſtini acquieſcimus, non defuiſſe Deo pro ſua omnipotentia & ſapientia alios modos poſſibiles, ſed hunc convenientiſſimum eſſe viſum.* *we reſt ſatisfied in St.* Auſtin's *opinion, that God, who is infinitely wiſe and powerful, did not want other poſſible ways* (for the Redemption of Mankind) *but judged this the moſt convenient of all.*

And here I muſt once more take notice of that account the Doctor gives of the neceſſity of Satisfaction, which he reſolves into *a natural vindictive Juſtice, which makes it impoſſible that Gods anger ſhould be diverted from ſinners, without the interpoſing of a Propitiation.* Upon which account he tells us, *that whatever diſcoveries were made of the patience and lenity of God unto us, yet if it were not withal revealed, that the other Properties of God, as his Juſtice and Revenge for ſin, had their actings alſo aſſigned them to the full, there could be little conſolation gathered from the former.* This account (as I then thought and think ſo ſtill) makes a very unworthy Repreſentation of Almighty God; as if he were ſo juſt, that he is cruel and ſavage, and irreconcilable, till he has taken

Knowledge of Chriſt, P. 45, 47. Edit. 2. P. 31, 33.

ken his fill of Revenge, and represents the whole design of Christs Death to be only a satisfaction of Revenge, without which God could not be appeased; as if Divine Vengeance (as I then expressed it out of a just indignation to such a horrid Doctrin) *did glut and satiate* itself with the bloud of Christ, instead of the bloud of the sinner. This Dr. *Owen* makes very severe Reflexions on, as blasphemous and prophane; and I will not deny upon second thoughts, but that it might have been more inoffensively expressed; for there is an *Euphemia* due from us, when we speak of sacred things, and it is not fit always to represent such Doctrins in their true and proper colors: But every one might easily perceive that I did not intend it as any disparagement to the satisfaction of our Saviour, to which we owe all our present Mercies and future hopes, but as the natural Interpretation and Language of the Doctors Argument.

I deny not that Anger, and Fury, and Vengeance are in Scripture attributed to God, when it speaks after the manner of men, to signifie the severity of those judgments, which God will inflict upon obstinate sinners; but to think, that the Death of Christ, who was his only and his belo-

ved Son, was a ſatisfaction of his natural and unappeaſable Vengeance and Fury, is ſuch an account as the Scripture no where gives us of the Death of Chriſt, as is incredible in it ſelf, and irreconcileable with the other Perfections of the Divine Nature.

But let us hear what the Doctor has to ſay for himſelf, and he tells us, *That all he intended by that which he aſſerted, is no more but this, that ſuch is the eſſential Holineſs and Righteouſneſs of the Nature of God, that conſidering him as the ſupreme Governour and Ruler of Mankind, it was inconſiſtent with the holineſs and rectitude of his Rule, and the glory of his Government, to paſs by Sin abſolutely, or to pardon it without Satisfaction, Propitiation or Atonement.* That God being infinitely holy, does perfectly hate all wickedneſs, and that as he is the ſupreme Governour of the world, he juſtly may, and in ſome caſes cannot conſiſtently with his Holineſs and Wiſdom, and the ends of his Government, do any other than puniſh ſin, is denied by no body that I know: But the Doctor proceeds farther, that God as a holy and juſt Governour, is under a neceſſity of Nature to puniſh every ſin that is committed; that though the ſinner repent of his ſins, and humbly confeſs

Vind. p. 43

and

and bewail them, and ſincerely reform, yet Juſtice muſt be ſatisfied either with the puniſhment of the ſinner, or ſome other in his ſtead: Thus he ſtates it in his *Diatriba de Juſtitiâ*, p. 2. *Juſtitiam peccati vindicatricem Deo eſſe naturalem contendo, & in exercitio neceſſariam*, i.e. *I contend and earneſtly aſſert, that that Juſtice which takes vengeance on ſin, is natural to God, and neceſſary in the exerciſe of it.* Now this is a very different thing from the Juſtice of Government, which allows the moſt juſt and righteous Judges to pardon Offences, when the ends of Government may as well be attained by Indulgence as by Puniſhment.

And therefore the Doctor diſtinguiſhes between *Jus Regiminis poſitivum & naturale*, between a poſitive and natural Right of Government: The Poſitive Right is ſuch as Magiſtrates have over their Subjects, and this (he aſſerts) they may recede from in ſome extraordinary caſes, when it is for the Publick Good and Benefit not to puniſh; becauſe the Safety of the People and the Publick Benefit, is the ſupreme Law to ſuch Governours: But the Natural Right of Government is that which God has over his Creatures, and this is immutable, and therefore God cannot recede from it; which as it is ſaid with-

Diatriba de Juſtit. p. 160.

out any reaſon (for whether the Right be Poſitive or Natural, it does not alter the Nature, nor the prudent Rules and Methods of Government) ſo it gives a plain account, what the Doctor means by Gods Right of puniſhing as Governour, which anſwers to what we call Revenge in private perſons, which immediately reſpects himſelf and not the publick ends of Government; which is the true difference between private Revenge and publick Juſtice; and though this be all the Doctor intends, yet that all is enough in all reaſon, and is the very all which I charged him with.

Well but I ſay as much as this comes to, when I aſſert, *that God is an irreconcilable enemy to all wickedneſs:* By no means, for this does not prove, that God muſt neceſſarily puniſh the ſinner, but that he will certainly either deſtroy ſin or the ſinner, that he can never be reconciled to any wicked man, while he continues wicked, and that he will certainly expreſs his diſpleaſure againſt all obſtinate and incorrigible ſinners; the difference is juſt as much as between ſuch a Juſtice as puniſhes the penitent, and that which puniſhes the incorrigible; the firſt is ſuch Severity at beſt, as becomes not a good Man, and a

wiſe

wiſe Governour; the ſecond is juſtified and applauded by the univerſal conſent of Mankind.

But the Doctor would retort all theſe ill conſequences, which I caſt upon his Notion upon my ſelf: *He preſumes, I own the Satisfaction of Chriſt*, and this is the firſt time he hath gheſſed right, but what then? *Therefore alſo I own, that God would not pardon any Sin, but upon a ſuppoſition of a previous Satisfaction made by Jeſus Chriſt*: very right ſtill, when he had decreed that he would not: *Here then lies all the difference between us, that he ſays God could not pardon Sin without Satisfaction, and I ſay, that although he might have done ſo without the leaſt diminution of his glory, yet he would not*: and this is a good wide difference between *could not* and *would not*: The firſt repreſents Satisfaction to be the effect of a private Revenge, the ſecond to be the effect of Wiſdom and Counſel in chooſing the moſt convenient way to diſpenſe his Pardon. God, we preſume, had more ways than one to ſecure the Authority of his Laws, the Glory of his Government, and to vindicate the Holineſs of his Nature, but he choſe this as the beſt and fitteſt. It had not been conſiſtent with the Wiſdom of God, as Governour of the world,

to

to have pardoned ſin in ſuch a way as would have reflected any diſparagement on his Holineſs, or looſened the Reins of Government; and therefore if he had not choſe this way, he would certainly have choſe ſome other, and then he might have rejected this, but could not wiſely reject all: Chriſt, according to theſe Principles, did not die for ſinners, becauſe God could not forgive ſin without ſuch a penal ſatisfaction, but becauſe he preferred this way before all other, as the moſt effectual to attain its end.

And now I preſume my Readers may be as glad as my ſelf, to ſee a Concluſion of this long Diſpute: Some poſſibly will think I have ſaid too much, and ſome too little: I have taken notice of every thing which was material in my Adverſaries, and of too many things which were not; and though I have not particularly taken notice of Mr. *POLHILL* and *ANTISOZZO*, it was becauſe there was no need of it: Whatever is conſiderable in them is anſwered in theſe Papers; and as for *ANTISOZZO*, I had no mind to play the Buffoon, as he does, and I know no other way of anſwering him: And I hope the world will be ſufficiently convinced

vinced, what a deſperate caſe Fanaticiſm is reduced to, when they are forced upon all occaſions to take Sanctuary in Buffoonry; but others may do as they pleaſe, as for my part I am reſolved this Controverſie ſhall never end in a Trial of Wit.

---

*FINIS.*